DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 665 SO 023 872

AUTHOR Mehlinger, Howard
TITLE The High School Political Science Curriculum Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Social Studies Development Center, Bloomington, Ind.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 77
CONTRACT SED-72-05814-A08
NOTE 106p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Citizenship Education; *Curriculum Development; Educational Research; High Schools; *Political Science; Social Studies; Student Participation; *United States Government (Course)

ABSTRACT

This project was designed to improve political science instruction for high school students in the United States. Its primary purpose was to design, develop, test, and disseminate an alternative program for the U.S. government course for grade 12 that sought to increase choices for teachers who wanted to improve basic citizenship competencies of students by offering important political science knowledge, skills, and participation training. The report describes the project activities in which three successive sets of curriculum materials were developed. Prototype units were tested in 25 schools across the United States. Based on the field tests of these materials, a full semester course was developed and tested. Evaluations and revisions were completed, a full year course was produced, and the course was tested in schools. Evaluations were conducted on each unit of the instructional materials. Student achievement was tested, teacher workability was surmised, and critic reviews were solicited from social scientists, social studies educators, teachers, students, parents, and minority group representatives. The findings of the project were: (1) an alternative program in U.S. government is needed at the high school level and will be used by teachers; (2) schools can use participation activities in school and the community to increase the citizenship competencies of students; (3) field testing is essential to the development of workable curriculum materials; and (4) in evaluating a curriculum product, face to face communication between curriculum designers and potential users is essential. As a result of creating an alternative that increased choices for teachers and focused on participation, students should become more skilled in actively participating in a democracy. (Author/DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 665

FINAL REPORT

THE HIGH SCHOOL POLITICAL SCIENCE CURRICULUM PROJECT

GRANT NO: SED 72-05814 A08

GRANTEE INSTITUTION: AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

EVRON KIRKPATRICK,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RICHARD SNYDER, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PRE-COLLEGIATE EDUCATION

SUBCONTRACTING INSTITUTION: INDIANA UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION,
SOCIAL STUDIES DEVELOPMENT CENTER

HOWARD MEHLINGER, DIRECTOR

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

DIVISION OF SCIENCE EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JOHN J. PATRICK
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DECEMBER, 1977

SO 023 872

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
Washington, D.C. 20550

SUMMARY OF COMPLETED PROJECT

Form Approved
OMB No. 99R0013

Please read instructions on reverse carefully before completing this form.

1. INSTITUTION AND ADDRESS	2. NSF PROGRAM	3. GRANT PERIOD
Indiana University Foundation P.O. Box F Bloomington, Indiana 47401	Pre-College Education in Science (SED)	from March 1972 to September 1977

4. GRANT NUMBER	5. BUDGET DUR. (MOS)	6. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S)	7. GRANTEE ACCOUNT NUMBER
SED 72-05814 A08	66	Howard Mehlinger	57-421-03

8. SUMMARY (Attach list of publications to form)

This project was designed to improve political science instruction for high school students in the United States. Its primary purpose was to design, develop, test, and disseminate an alternative program for American government at the twelfth-grade level. The program seeks to increase choices for teachers who want to improve basic citizenship competencies of students by offering important political science knowledge, skills, and participation training.

During the five years of project activities, three successive sets of curriculum materials were developed. First, prototype units were tested in 25 schools across the United States. Based on the field tests of these materials, a full-semester course was developed and tested in the next year. Evaluations and revisions were completed on the semester course, and a full-year course was produced. It was then tested in schools across the United States in the third and final field test of the material. All in all, over 50 pilot teachers participated in giving important feedback on the materials and in using them in a wide range of schools.

Evaluations were conducted on each unit of the instructional materials. Student achievement was tested, teacher workability was surmised, and critic reviews were solicited from social scientists, social studies educators, teachers, students, and parents, as well as minority group representatives. A series of dissemination activities included making presentations at conferences, attending meetings, holding workshops, and publishing articles. These activities helped in sharing information about the project and improving feedback about the ideas and instructional materials. The program will be published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., for use in high schools in the 1978-79 school year.

The findings of the project can be listed as follows:

1. An alternative program in American government is needed at the high school level and will be used by teachers;
2. Schools can use participation activities both in the school and the community which increase the citizenship competencies of students. This applies to any type of school across the United States and not only to selected "lighthouse" schools;
3. A field test is essential to the development of workable curriculum materials;
4. In evaluating a curriculum product, face-to-face communication between designers of the curriculum and potential users--including administrators, teachers, students, and community members--is essential.

The implications of these findings are that, as a result of creating an alternative which increases choices for teachers and focuses on participation, students will become more skilled in actively participating in a democracy. Although this curriculum product is only one important factor in the citizenship education of students, it can make a difference in the basic skills which students need to be active, effective, and responsible citizens.

9. SIGNATURE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/ PROJECT DIRECTOR	TYPED OR PRINTED NAME	DATE
Howard Mehlinger	Howard D. Mehlinger	12/28/77

NSF Form 98A (5-76)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PROJECT ACTIVITIES 3

Design and Conceptualization 5

Prototype Development 10

The Field Test 14

Evaluation and Diffusion 18

Publication 21

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 24

Results 24

Recommendations 27

APPENDIX A: Project Staff 37

APPENDIX B: Activities Completed by Project 53

APPENDIX C: Curriculum Materials 54

APPENDIX D: Pilot Schools 56

APPENDIX E: Evaluation Instruments and Reports . . . 58

APPENDIX F: Publications 60

APPENDIX G: Presentations 63

APPENDIX H: Bid Specifications and List of Publishers Contacted. 69

APPENDIX I: Contract for publication. 85

FINAL REPORT OF THE
HIGH SCHOOL POLITICAL SCIENCE CURRICULUM PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

The High School Political Science Curriculum Project was funded by the National Science Foundation from March, 1972 through September, 1977. The American Political Science Association was the grantee institution, and the APSA Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, chaired by Professor Richard Snyder, monitored the grant. A sub-contract for curriculum development, evaluation, and dissemination was awarded to the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University. There, Judith Gillespie, Howard Mehlinger, and John Patrick co-directed the Project. The activities discussed in this final report are those conducted by the Center at Indiana University.

The purpose of the Project was to design, develop, test, and disseminate an alternative program for high school American government. Throughout the five-year period of the grant, activities in design, curriculum development, evaluation, dissemination, and administration were carried out in order to achieve these purposes. A nation-wide field test of the materials was implemented during three successive years. The materials are now in the process of publication with Prentice-Hall, Inc. The text and related material will be available for use by teachers across the nation in the 1978-79 school year.

This final report outlines the activities of the Project in

each of its stages. It also summarizes the outcomes of the Project and its findings and implications for future development work. The report is divided into two major sections. One section describes project activities and the second establishes outcomes and offers recommendations.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES

The activities of the project span a five-year period and a coordinated effort to develop a year-long American government course.

The staff followed the model for curriculum development which is reflected in the outline below. The model demonstrates that a step-by-step sequence of tasks to be undertaken beginning with the design and conceptualization of the program and proceeding through the field test to the preparation of the published version of the materials.

Major steps in the Development Cycle used by the High School Political Science Curriculum Project

9. Diffusion occurs at each of these stages

1. Design and conceptualization
2. Preparation of prototype materials according to design
3. Testing of prototypes
4. Preparation of complete unit or course in accord with modifications of prototypes
5. Testing of unit or course
6. Revisions of unit or course on basis of testing
7. Final testing of program
8. Preparation of commercial version for publishers and of final report

10. Evaluation occurs at each of these stages

There is a linear sequence of steps in the model described above. However, the model also calls for simultaneous activity and feedback. In the design and conceptualization stage, for example, a great many activities were carried out related to the diffusion of the ideas. Project staff sought to test their ideas for the design and conceptualization with a nation-wide audience. At the same time, specific evaluations were sought for the conceptualization, and plans were made for a full evaluation effort throughout the life of the Project. Therefore, at each stage in the eight stage sequence, diffusion and evaluation activities were carried out as well as development activities.

As a result of following this particular model, a wide range of staff were engaged in the Project throughout all phases of activity. These staff members are listed in Appendix A. The APSA Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education monitored the planning decisions of the Project and a core staff of developers, evaluators and assistants worked consistently throughout five years of activity. In addition to the core staff, pilot teachers across the nation, field consultants working with pilot schools, and evaluators from universities, school systems, local communities and specific interest groups were employed in a variety of tasks. The long list of staff and assistants reflects the scope and breadth of the activities that were undertaken.

Under each of the eight steps in the model, there were a wide range of specific activities carried out. Basically, they fall into categories of development, evaluation, diffusion and publication.

The timing and sequence for each of these activities is summarized briefly in the chart in Appendix B. A discussion of the activities and the outcomes of each stage is presented in the paragraphs which follow.

Design and Conceptualization

Design and conceptualization work began as early as 1970. At the time of funding in March, 1972, a base for conceptualization was established. It was elaborated and evaluated throughout the remainder of the year. The activities for this period can be listed as follows:

1. Preliminary papers were written on key conceptual elements of the Project.
2. A monograph was developed outlining the content and instructional design for the instructional materials as well as their implications for school change.
3. Evaluations were undertaken by the APSA Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education and over fifty social scientists and educators, as well as teachers and students, regarding the design for the project materials.
4. Presentations were conducted at meetings of teachers and social science educators in order to test basic ideas and spread the word about the Project.

The basic ideas behind the Project were presented in preliminary papers and the monograph. Four core ideas summarize the innovation of the Project and are reflected in its final instructional product.

First, a conceptualization of politics was presented which was different from that found in standard American government

courses. The course was titled Comparing Political Experiences (CPE) because of the emphasis on the systemic nature of politics and because of the desire to demonstrate that American politics does not exist in a vacuum. Key political ideas such as decision-making, conflict and resources are salient in any political system whether it be local, state, national or international. Therefore, we were interested in having students compare experiences across groups within the United States, between the United States and other nations, and in transnational organizations. These basic ideas of emphasizing the relationship of the individual to the system, rather than individual actions per se and the fundamental similarities of political experiences in any system across both types of organizations and levels, were fundamental to the course. This innovation has been retained in the published version of the materials, and continues to represent a distinct difference between CPE and other available alternatives.

The project also conceptualized social science skills in new ways. The staff developed a set of competencies necessary for citizenship. Many specialized skills had been developed for college bound students. Other courses had been developed which featured an institutional approach and basic knowledge. A course had not been developed which would be aimed at the average citizen to develop social science skills and competencies for citizenship. Therefore, a skill component was developed for the

course focusing on such important skills as asking questions, making generalizations and working with evidence in order to aim at the average citizen in developing important skills for everyday political activity. The skill component of the course is unique, and remains one of the most significant and distinctive features of the published version of the materials.

Perhaps the most unique idea in the program is the development of competencies in actually participating as an effective citizen in a wide range of school and community groups as well as those on the state, national and international levels. The staff began with the idea that to promote effective citizenship, students needed not only to know ideas and be able to work with evidence, but essential training in participation was needed as well. The idea was developed that the school would become a laboratory for instruction in political participation. The belief was that students might develop habits of participation which would be carried forth into their roles as adult citizens. After five years of consulting and testing this idea, it remains CPE's most distinctive feature as an American government program. This part of the program has probably undergone more fundamental revision and testing than any other part, yet it is one of the most successful aspects of the program. We do believe that this idea is not only accepted by schools, but in the last decade it has become even more relevant as citizens' groups take more of an active part in government.

Finally, the staff was interested in promoting some important

ideas in instructional methodology. A mastery learning method which allows students to proceed at different levels and to have continuous checks and rechecks on their learning of materials has been made an integral part of the course. Therefore, the published version of the course contains not only tests, but sequenced measures for demonstrating the achievement of competencies as well as reinforcement and extension exercises so that student learning can be paced according to students' abilities. The staff also focused on the ideas of perceived purpose and instructional variety. A wide range of types of lessons have been incorporated into the course, each with a well-articulated set of objectives which gives purpose to students' work.

Having developed these key ideas regarding the course, the staff conducted a test of the ideas by making presentations and inviting evaluations from a wide range of reviewers. High school teachers were active in the Social Studies Development Center during this period, and gave important advice about the practical aspects of the ideas. The APSA Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education consulted in producing the monograph by Gillespie and Patrick which is listed along with other publications in Appendix F. Social scientists and social studies educators from across the country reviewed the design and conceptualization material. In all, over fifty individuals read the preliminary papers and monographs and critiqued the ideas.

The outcomes of this period were several. We discovered that our ideas were both unique and sound. We were not repli-

cating others work, nor did people have major contentions to take with our ideas for a new course. The critiques caused us to expand our conceptualization and concretize it in ways that we had not thought about before. We reduced the number of skills taught in the course so that we taught fewer skills in more depth and developed ideas for working with many more basic skills, such as gathering evidence, than we had originally determined. The participation component was changed and reformed according to many of the ideas given to us. Because of warning from school practitioners and social scientists, we determined that the participation component was the most unique and difficult of those in the course, and we would emphasize it in the field test in order to work out major problems of implementation.

During this period the staff generated three major papers and a monograph, as well as a list of over 200 pilot schools which wanted to participate in the project. We presented ideas about the project to over 1500 people during this period and sought ideas and advice as well as began to prepare the ground work for the appearance of an innovative product. The diffusion activities are outlined in Appendix G. It is important that at this stage in the project we were beginning to inform people of our ideas and to prepare them for important innovations in social studies instruction. This group of 1500 people has multiplied geometrically during successive years of the Project and, as a result, a core of highly interested individuals in key decision-making positions across the United States are both well-informed and interested in promoting the innovation.

Prototype Development

The prototype development period of the Project lasted through the 1973-74 school year. It was the first instructional development phase of the Project. The following activities were undertaken:

1. Nine prototype units were developed from two-to-eight weeks in duration. They covered essential concepts, skills and participation activities in the course.

2. Evaluation instruments were developed and a design for the field test was constructed.

3. The prototype units were tested in 25 pilot schools across the country in every region and every major type of school district.

4. Dissemination activities were carried out, new papers were produced and ideas were presented at meetings across the country.

The prototype units were developed based on the conceptualization and the critiques that staff had received. The prototype units are listed with the other curriculum products of the Project in Appendix C. The units focused on major concepts, skills and participation experiences in the course. Four of the nine prototype units focused on the participation skills, as the staff had recognized that this would be the most difficult part of the product to develop. Concepts were tested in a variety of ways, and fully developed skill units were tested in all pilot schools.

An evaluation was designed and conducted on each of the prototype units. A five-dimensional evaluation design included student achievement tests for each unit of the course, background instruments on students and teachers in the form of paper-

and-pencil questionnaires, site visits on the part of developers to classrooms using the prototype units, teacher logs which called for teacher's activities and evaluations of each phase of the prototype activity, and critiques from outside consultants. This evaluation package was comprehensive, and the amount and scope of data that was gathered was fully adequate to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the prototypes.

The prototype units were tested in 25 pilot schools across the nation. These pilot schools along with others used during the field test are listed in Appendix D. The staff chose pilot schools out of a sample of 200 volunteers. The schools represented every region in the country. They were also classified according to variations in size, socio-economic characteristics, and racial heterogeneity. One of the most important characteristics was that the schools varied in political type. Some schools were "elite," and the principal made most of the decisions. Others already had active student involvement in school activities. The staff felt that it was important to test whether or not the participation activities would work in a variety of types of schools, so that a program was not developed which would exclude major types of schools from the potential users for the course. Generally, teachers in the pilot schools taught regular American government courses and the prototype units were inserted at convenient times for teachers in their regular teaching of their 12th grade American government course. All in all, the

course was used by approximately 26 teachers with over 2500 students in this field test.

The results of the evaluation are contained in reports found in Appendix E. Basically, work and evaluation included the analysis of the results of the internal evaluation which the staff conducted through its evaluator, critiques by over 100 social scientists and social studies educators, and dissemination work in meetings through which the staff shared ideas and promoted a climate for change.

During this period developers discovered that there were weaknesses both in the curriculum materials and in the evaluation. The participation activities misjudged the "entry" position of students. Students did not consider themselves to be political actors, nor did they possess even the most basic skills in participation. The participation activities were revised to make students more aware of their position as political actors on an everyday basis, and roles and skills were developed which stressed fundamental work in groups and roles that students would take in participation. These activities would precede major attempts to have students make decisions, or otherwise participate in the school or community.

Several other findings included the need to work with concepts differentially across the course. The prototype units domonstrated that several alternative ways of concept development were successful in the classroom, and the the variety of lessons was as important as the method of presentation.

Therefore, the staff determined that concepts would be sequenced and developed using different instruction methods throughout the course. The number of skills taught in the course was again cut back to the most essential, for it took teachers about twice as long to teach the skills as the staff had originally anticipated.

The staff also discovered a great deal about the evaluation and conducting the field test. The staff had been far too ambitious in its evaluation plan, and much more data was generated than could be used. Significant input was made by site visits, and insights were gained through these visits that other instruments could not yield. Developers determined that there was a necessity to make the site visits a very salient dimension in the evaluation. Plans for cutting back on instruments and making them more workable, especially in the use of the teacher log, were made as well as plans for full-scale site visits which would complement the survey information.

The staff generated several products during this period. The nine prototype units were the major product of the Project. Evaluation instruments were also constructed. Four major papers were written and delivered at conventions across the United States. The network of interested teachers and university professionals more than doubled during this period. A set of field consultants attached to the pilot shcools from universities and centers made a major contribution to the regional diffusion of the project, the monitoring of the pilot test, and eventually would be well-informed about the total scope and sequence of the final product so that there would be an invalu-

able dissemination network as well as a group which could help teachers with the implementation of the program.

The Field Test

During the period of the major field test of the project, course materials were developed, evaluations were conducted, a wide range of critical reviews were solicited, and the diffusion campaign was intensified. This period of approximately two years was the most intensive development, evaluation and dissemination period of the project. The sequence of activities can be listed as follows:

1. A full semester of course materials was developed for use in the 1974-75 pilot test.
2. A full year of materials was developed for use in the 1975-76 pilot test.
3. Workshops were conducted to train a portion of the pilot teachers prior to each field test.
4. Evaluation of each unit of pilot material was conducted throughout the two-year period. Comparative evaluations of other courses in relation to the Comparing Political Experiences material were carried out.
5. Critic reviews of the materials were conducted by scholars across the United States, and materials were revised based on the 1974-75 field test. Revisions were also begun on the full-year course prior to publication.
6. Diffusion activities were conducted at conferences and meetings across the United States.

The development of curriculum materials was intensive during this period. Based on the findings from the prototype tests, a full semester of materials was written. Some prototypes were dropped entirely; others were revised, and approximately 75 percent of the full-semester material was freshly written. This

material was then field tested, and a full year course was developed using some of the successful materials and adding new materials. An entirely new semester of materials was also developed for the course. During this intensive period, a total of fourteen curriculum units were developed, tested, revised, and retested. The materials are listed in Appendix C.

Evaluation was conducted of each unit of instructional material in both the semester pilot test and the full-year test. Basic background instruments, paper-and-pencil questionnaires testing student achievement, teacher reviews, site visits, and consultant critiques were all part of the evaluation process. Again, staff found that the site visits to pilot schools were invaluable. The evaluators also revised instruments and devised forms which streamlined their ability to collect data and to use it for revisions. An important addition to the evaluation work at this phase of the Project was the consultant work done by the National Evaluation Systems in Amherst, Massachusetts. The group was hired as an outside evaluation organization for the Project. They developed both generalized tests across the full-year course and specific unit tests to be used to assess student achievement in each unit. This work was analyzed by National Evaluation Systems, and a full report on the evaluation has been forwarded to the National Science Foundation. The combination of internal and external evaluation yielded data that was useful to the developers in revising the curriculum materials and in shaping the content and structure of the course. The evalua-

tion instruments prepared by both internal and external evaluators are listed in Appendix E.

Approximately 30-35 pilot schools across the nation used the full-semester course and the same number with some changes in personnel used the full-year course, bringing to the developers feedback for revisions. These pilot schools are listed in Appendix D. The pilot schools again represented a varied regional, socio-economic, racial, and school political type sample. Our basic findings were that the course was not inhibited by different types of school political organization. Participation opportunities for students existed in all types of schools. The course seemed to be most applicable to its primary audience--average students who would not necessarily go on to college and who would become typical voters. The pilot test demonstrated that the use of the course in urban areas in the public schools was successful. Although the course seemed to preclude some "lighthouse" college prep classes, it did not lack appeal for the entire spectrum of students in schools.

The instructional material was developed, evaluated, and revised during this period. A great many revisions were suggested by literally dozens of critic reviewers. They are listed in Appendix A. During this period, the staff found that face-to-face communication with critic reviewers was essential to the process. Often reviews were vague or misunderstood by the developers until face-to-face communication could clarify their meaning. Therefore, a series of selective conferences on evalua-

tion were conducted so that ideas could be fully developed and the implementation of the critiques could be discussed. We believe that this added demonstrably to the evaluation process and highly recommend it for other evaluation efforts.

During this period, the diffusion of the materials was carried out full-scale. Sample copies were distributed to over 1,000 teachers across the United States. Presentations were made at every major social studies meeting throughout the two-year period. The diffusion activities are listed in Appendix G. The publications are outlined in Appendix F. It is important to note here that during 1976 a series of six regional diffusion conferences were held on a separate National Science Foundation grant. These conferences reached over 300 curriculum decision-makers throughout the United States and sought their feedback on the materials and problems and opportunities they saw for the dissemination and implementation of the materials.

There are several outcomes from this period. The curriculum materials themselves were developed. This, in itself, was an intensive effort. The evaluation was intensified by not only the internal evaluation team, but also the addition of National Evaluation Systems to the evaluation work. Some valuable prototypic evaluation instruments were constructed which have been models for evaluating students' citizenship skills for other organizations. In addition, presentations were made across the United States and major papers were developed.

Evaluation and Diffusion

From the end of the pilot tests through the publication of the materials, a great deal of diffusion and evaluation work was done. Of course, this work had begun at the outset of the project, but a culmination of activities conducted during the four-year conceptualization and field test period was reached. All in all, the evaluation was one of the most comprehensive that the staff knows of for any project, including over 100 professionals in critiques, internal and external evaluation, and multiple tests of achievement, interests, and attitudes across every unit developed for the course.

The evaluation included comprehensive survey documents distributed to over 2500 students and the solicitation of critiques. However, this information, like most survey research, misses a great deal of the specific needs of the project. Site visits with pilot teachers and face-to-face evaluations with critic reviewers added an important dimension to the evaluation.

Throughout the life of the Project, the evaluation became increasingly more simple. The staff grew to value direct and straightforward evaluation which would give both general and intensive evaluations in a short space. The evaluation forms were increasingly streamlined and increasingly generalized, allowing evaluation of basic characteristics of the course and the major outcomes, rather than complex, open-ended material. This type of evaluation proved to be useful. It is also much more cost-efficient and the outcomes are easier to analyze and evaluate.

To date, the evaluation has been a formative one. Some evaluation has been done by both the internal staff and the external evaluators, yet there is a need to determine whether or not students do transfer what is learned in the course beyond their twelfth-grade American government classes. The American Political Science Association, through its Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, is now interested in sponsoring a longitudinal research project to determine the impact of Comparing Political Experiences and other courses on the knowledge, skills and participation activities of students beyond the twelfth grade. The study is being designed and will be sent as a proposal for funding so that a long-term research study can determine the ultimate impact of the published materials. This study will be an invaluable contribution to curriculum development as well as socialization research and other fields seeking to determine whether or not courses which attempt to make transfers into students' everyday lives actually have an impact beyond the particular course and level at which they are presented.

Diffusion work, like evaluation work, was carried out during the entire project and was multi-faceted. The presentation phase of the diffusion effort definitely reached teachers across the country. The evaluation and the presentations also allowed the staff to reach a professional audience of social studies educators and political scientists. The diffusion conferences held in regions across the country filled an important

gap by promoting an intensive look at the instructional program by key curriculum decision-makers. In addition, evaluation work allowed staff to include both parents and minority group members in the evaluation of the product and established a diffusion base which included several special interest groups.

The directors believe that it is important to have included the entire spectrum of types of diffusion activities in order to make the course well known. Only time will tell whether or not this diffusion activity pays off in terms of the actual use of the program. Use of the program, however, is only one part of the process. We are as interested in having people use the ideas of the project and adapt and model them in their own schools, curriculum centers, and professional associations. Ample evidence can be provided that there is increasing use of the ideas about participation and some of the instructional techniques in Comparing Political Experiences in other textbooks, in professional settings, and in writings about the course. Documentary evidence of this is contained in Appendix F.

The chief outcomes of the diffusion and evaluation efforts have been the establishment of a network of individuals involved in social science education who are both intensively familiar with the course and concerned about its implementation. This network has established a base for the publisher which is unprecedented for an American government course. At this point in time, the publisher is beginning to work with that diffusion base as well as the developers in establishing a wide-ranging

and intensive marketing strategy.

Publication

The publication period from 1976 through 1977 included the following activities.

1. Bids were sought in Spring, 1976, from all potential publishers of social studies materials at the high school level.

2. The decision was made by the staff, the APSA Pre-Collegiate Committee, and the National Science Foundation to accept the bid offered by Prentice-Hall, Inc. to publish the course.

3. Initial work with the publisher provided an important impetus to changes and consolidation of the course which was consistent with the evaluations previously given.

4. Judith Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus, the authors of the program, worked with the editors at Prentice-Hall on the publication version of the materials.

5. A marketing plan was initiated and marketing activities for the course were begun.

6. A contract to publish the instructional program was signed and approved by the National Science Foundation in December, 1977 (Appendix I).

In Spring, 1976, bids were sought on the Comparing Political Experiences program. Publishers had been made aware of the program through two publishers conferences held in 1974 and 1975. In these conferences, any publisher could attend at their own expense and review and ask questions about the program. The publishers which were contacted and the bid specifications which were distributed are included in Appendix H. The bidding process lasted approximately four months, and bids were prepared by J.B. Lippincott and Prentice-Hall, Inc.

The staff encouraged the acceptance of Prentice-Hall as the publisher because of strong management interest in the course, because of an opportunity to publish CPE as its sole American government offering, and by the full-scale marketing effort which would be made. These criteria and others brought the staff, the APSA Pre-Collegiate Committee, and the National Science Foundation to the decision that Prentice-Hall, Inc. would be the publisher of the course. This decision was made in August, 1976.

The authors and the editorial, management, and marketing staff then began working on the program. Revisions of the conceptualization were planned and the two-semester course was integrated together in ways that it had not been previously. Revisions of the materials were then conducted under the new conceptualization.

A review of the new conceptualization by management, marketing, and the editorial at Prentice-Hall produced a desire to change the conceptualization and to rework the materials. A conflict between the publisher and the authors developed which was resolved with basic compromises made on the dimensions of the course. Full representation of key dimensions of the course was guaranteed by the publisher. Insertion of more detailed material on the structure and function of American government was agreed to by the developers. As a result, between June, 1977, and October, 1977, the materials were entirely rewritten to fit the new format. Therefore, there were two generations of revisions

of the entire course made in concert with the publisher.

A marketing plan was devised. Social Education ads and others were placed in prominent positions. Authors are now proceeding to make presentations on the course at the publisher's expense and to acquaint marketing staff with the dimensions of the course.

An extension of funds was approved by the National Science Foundation from July 1 to September 30, 1977, for the grant. No additional funds were required; the time and work was needed in order to complete the second publication revision of the materials.

The outcomes of this period include successive revisions of the course and the published product which is in the process of being printed. The course materials will be available for use in the 1978-79 school year. A hardbound copy of the printed materials, as well as a teacher's guide and an auxiliary skills and evaluation package will be sent to the National Science Foundation upon its printing by the publisher.

It is important to note here that we feel that the work with the publisher was worthwhile. The marketing staff at Prentice-Hall far outreaches any that could be used by a non-commercial publisher. The compromises which were made do justice to both the innovation in the course and the needs of the market. The compromises were tough ones, but the authors' investment in the course will continue beyond the life of the project to include both marketing and revision efforts.

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Two questions which might typically be raised regarding any project are: 1) What are the results of the project? and 2) What recommendations can you make? It seems appropriate here to codify a set of results and recommendations. They represent a summary of the findings of the staff, and by no means the details of our experiences.

Results

The most tangible result of the Project is the instructional materials. The experimental materials continue to be widely used by teachers and curriculum consultants. The published form of the materials will be the primary result of the Project. The published version represents an innovation that surely would not have existed without National Science Foundation funding. The number of publishers who were interested in the Project and the final revisions made by Prentice-Hall attest to the thesis that a publisher would not have funded such a project, nor could the authors have carried it out without sizeable funding from an outside source. National Science Foundation funds, then, were spent to produce an innovative product which otherwise would not have been developed.

Less tangible results are hard to pinpoint. However, we are sure that the ideas behind the innovation have been spread widely

throughout the United States. The concept focus on politics is unique, and has yielded both research and curriculum development using similar concepts. The skill development package is one of the most comprehensive included in a government text. Perhaps even more important, the participation dimension of the project has spawned both research and development work in participation skills.

Participation has been recognized as an important component of citizenship and several projects are underway across the United States using some of the basic skills from the Comparing Political Experiences course. Byron Massialas's work at Florida State on the concept of the whole school as a political system is again stimulated by ideas from the course. A National Institute of Education research study was undertaken by Lee Ehman and Judith Gillespie as a result of the ideas from the curriculum, as was the case study project involving eight professionals across the United States in the study of schools based on the concepts of the Project. The ideas from the Project have spanned oceans to an international audience, and the project has been presented in international meetings of social scientists and educators. Both within the United States and across the world, then, the ideas for the Project have been spread, and people have built new projects and programs based on some of the fundamental notions shared in our dissemination activities.

Another result of the Project is a successful completion of a three-year field test involving high school teachers across the

country. The results for pilot teachers were several. They claim to have both enjoyed and learned from the participation in the field test. They became more supportive of innovation generally as a result of their work and more confident that university educators were "listening" to those in the field. The pilot teachers were excited about the experiment and, in many cases, the pilot testing of CPE produced innovations in the pilot schools. In addition to gathering important information for both research and practice, then, the field tests yielded some impetus for change in the pilot sample.

The Project also involved political scientists heavily in the monitoring of the Project through the APSA Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, the critiques which were solicited from political scientists, the field consultants working with pilot schools, and presentations at major political science meetings. It is safe to say that the Project spawned a commitment to pre-collegiate political science education in APSA which had not been present before. It also stimulated undergraduate instruction. The developers worked with political scientists across the country in workshops who wanted to improve undergraduate instruction using pre-collegiate principles of curriculum development and teaching. This commitment to teaching is institutionalized in the Division of Educational Affairs in the American Political Science Association. Their cooperation and involvement with members of the Association who are interested in pre-collegiate education was strengthened demonstrably by the Project.

The Project also spawned a set of evaluation instruments which others have used and improved in their own work. The data for the evaluation has been used by the developers. It has also been the subject of several graduate student dissertations and analysis by others in the field who were seeking to improve either evaluation instruments per se or their development work with teachers and students in the field.

Finally, the Project established a network for communication in political science education that had not existed before. Newsletters and associations with individuals through meetings and presentations have built a "community" of those interested in political science instruction and those who will follow through in their new-found interest at the pre-collegiate level. The number of proposals that were generated for new NSF teacher institutes and seminars in the most recent rounds of funding are testimony to the influence of the Project in the field. All of those individuals applying, at one time or another, contacted Project staff and wanted to talk out what could be done. Hopefully, the network for communication will continue because individuals will continue to interact over ideas in pre-collegiate political science education, not only from the Comparing Political Experiences program, but from other programs as well.

Recommendations

With a Project as long in its duration as this one and as

full of different kinds of activities, there are always strengths and weaknesses of a Project. The following recommendations stem from models we think are effective and mistakes we think we made. Our aim is to provide advice based on our experience for improving future projects. Nine recommendations are summarized below.

1. The project model established for the High School Political Science Curriculum Project is a viable one. The model for administration and development of the CPE program is an alternative to ones previously used by the National Science Foundation. In this case, the American Political Science Association received a grant, and a core staff at the Social Studies Development Center conducted the Project. Experts in the field did not write material. The staff was not spread across disciplines or regions of the country. In effect, the Project was conducted and carried out at the Social Studies Development Center, and the administration and implementation of the Project was conducted from a single point. We believe that this model is a successful one, and cost efficient in terms of both cooperation and product development. The model certainly stands as an alternative to other formulations which NSF has used. We can find no inherent weaknesses in the Project based on the model itself, and we find strengths of both collaboration and cost efficiency.

2. The comprehensive process of curriculum development, evaluation and diffusion used by the Project is a necessary and significant one. Experience has demonstrated that simultaneous development, evaluation and diffusion is an important iterative

process for curriculum development. If we had used a linear process, we would not have established the base for the curriculum innovation. Thinking about the evaluation would also not have had a sound base before the field tests, and the curriculum development work would not have been informed by each of these processes. We believe that it is important for curriculum development projects to consider an interative, rather than a sequential, model in the development process. The more holistic the model, and the more groups which are included in the process at its initiation, the finer will be the tuning on the curriculum product and the wider its dissemination and acceptance.

3. The time spent on conceptualization work for the product was necessary and significant. The National Science Foundation funded approximately eight months of concept development for the program. We view that initial base for the program as one of the essential steps in the initiation of any Project. Time to think, set a base, and interact with colleagues saves time and effort in the long run. Many of the ideas which were first defined during the conceptualization period have proved to be long-lasting and worthwhile because the base from which they were initiated was well researched and well thought out.

4. The field test for curriculum products needs to be both selective and intensive. Findings from the field test demonstrate that the Project probably could have been as well or better tested in about half as many pilot schools. A dozen could have served

the purpose. This would have allowed us to have done more intensive research in the schools using the program. It also would have cut down unnecessary expense in reproducing and duplicating several versions of the program. The importance of the combination of survey techniques and intensive face-to-face interaction as well as the cost of doing significant field testing has led us to the conclusion that the field tests should involve a select number of schools of a wide variety of types, and intensive evaluation within that set.

5. Interaction with publishers and concern for publication should be a continuous dimension of curriculum development work. We were concerned about publication from the outset of the Project. However, we did not involve publishers in the process. As much as diffusion and evaluation are important considerations, it is also important to include publishers and the publishing industry in the curriculum development process. The Social Studies Development Center did hold two publishers' conferences regarding the course, but we had no network of communication with publishers as we did with other significant segments in the education field. Our recommendation would be that publishers ought to be brought in early as consultants on projects so that basic market requirements could be incorporated in the concerns of the experimental materials. Our interaction with Prentice-Hall in the final stages of the CPE Project has led us to believe that similar input would have been made by almost any publisher in the field, and

that significant interaction should have occurred at an earlier date. This interaction does not exist within the publishing industry, let alone between the publishing industry and educators. It is an important, but difficult, interaction to accomplish. We believe promoting significant interaction would be a fruitful effort on the part of any curriculum development project.

6. Teacher associates should be incorporated into curriculum development projects. The High School Political Science Curriculum Project employed teacher associates during its field test stage. Teacher associates were borrowed from their school districts for a year with the school district paying half of their salary and the grant paying the other half. These teacher associates critiqued materials, did site visits, and otherwise contributed many services to the development and diffusion program. Input from practicing teachers who could be on site on an everyday basis was invaluable to the development of the program. The teachers also gained important knowledge and insight in their interaction with the staff and their activities in the Social Studies Development Center. We highly recommend the inclusion of such teachers in curriculum development work in the future.

7. The evaluation should be both direct and self-contained. We made several mistakes in the evaluation procedure. We tried to be too comprehensive at the outset. We believe it is important to think about the evaluation as much as the curriculum materials themselves, and to devise a direct and simplified evaluation system.

As it turned out, it did not work especially well to have an outside evaluation organization come into the Project. The timing of curriculum development is too rapid and turnover needs are too great for an outside organization to gear into the Project and to develop adequate instruments.

On the other hand, internal evaluators with full-time professional positions often have only marginal interest in the types of questions which the curriculum developers are asking. Therefore, the evaluation does not contribute to their professional interests enough to make an inside evaluator valuable. Perhaps another project in evaluation, funded simultaneously yet separately, could solve these problems. Neither the outside evaluation nor the internal evaluation model worked well in the case of this Project. A separate evaluation project would give an evaluator professional status and distinction aside from the curriculum project and would not contribute to problems of distance which were prominent in our relationship with National Evaluation Systems.

One thing we clearly learned from the evaluation was that the teacher is the most significant variable in evaluating curriculum materials. Of course, the developers must design lessons which are valuable and useful, yet whether or not they work depends a great deal on how teachers treat them in the classroom. Whether or not a curriculum such as this one is successful in the schools depends largely on the teacher. More evaluation, research, and training are needed in teacher education in order for instructional innovations to be successful in the classroom.

8. A wide communications network needs to be cultivated and financed in any curriculum development grant. The network established by the High School Political Science Curriculum Project is a vast and complex one. Each segment is necessary in order to cultivate a base for acceptance of the innovation. In our case, most of the networking needs were served on the "spare time" of the staff. In an effort to streamline a budget for a project, we do not believe that networking funds should be cut. This network will be invaluable throughout the life of the project, especially in its dissemination phase.

9. There needs to be follow-up on the impact and outcomes of projects. Although massive funding is certainly not needed, basic questions of the impact of curriculum materials which seek to transfer knowledge, skills, and participation experiences into students' everyday lives need follow-up. This must occur in terms of both research and assessment of the project. Too much has been written about the impact of the curriculum projects of the sixties without adequate follow-up studies on which to base generalizations. The Foundation should not stop its funding with the publication of the instructional materials. It should contribute to follow-up studies in order to give an empirical base to its assessment of the impact of a project. If the Foundation were to do this, it would provide important insights into what a curriculum product can and cannot do in terms of educational change and student achievement.

These recommendations summarize much of what project staff learned during the Project. It is too early to say, as some have said about many of the projects of the sixties, that the project did not work, or was not adequately disseminated. We do not know answers to these questions at this time. We do know that there needs to be some systematic way of monitoring its progress so that professionals and the public can determine empirically what the course does and does not do. We know that curriculum materials are only one part of the mix of educational innovation, and that innovation depends on individual school systems and, for that matter, on national policies which promote innovation in education. Yet, an adequate assessment of the impact of a curriculum product would make an important addition to the field.

There are other needs besides that of assessment. The Project has paid little attention to the kinds of curriculum policy decisions which allow innovations to fit into the high school curriculum. There is a need to work with schools on a K through 12 basis in order for organizational and policy back-up to be provided for innovation. Teachers must be able to find a slot in which to teach an innovative course, and to have adequate initial training and follow-through with students, which is essentially a decision of curriculum sequencing. Studies of how these curriculum decisions are made and pilot projects which work with individual schools on problems of curriculum decision-making are as important to consider as the curriculum products themselves. The

curriculum decisions which school districts make on an everyday basis can make or break the implementation and use of innovative products.

In addition to these needs, there has been little study of the adoption and implementation process itself. Research is needed on the interaction of government, publishers, authors, teachers, and citizens who participate in the policy process. More studies on the adoption process and the type of policy decisions which involve state-wide or district-wide selection of programs would be invaluable to the ultimate impact and dissemination of a program.

Finally, there needs to be continued assessment of the conjoining of a variety of types of projects in a nexus to promote educational change. At this point, we feel that if the curriculum development project had been coupled with a research project, a dissemination project, and others, using a variety of professionals from different bases, the impact of the innovation would have been enhanced. We provided only one impetus for change. Certainly the problem of innovation in schools is multifaceted and requires multiple spearheads for solution. Putting the burden of innovation on a single curriculum development project requires too much of the staff and the curriculum materials, and the expectations raised far exceed the resources of any single project. Combining projects together and professionals who share goals from various dimensions of the process of educational change would help in the solution of this problem.

Despite the caveats and needs stated above, we feel that we have produced an innovation which provides teachers with a real choice in the American government curriculum. The National Science Foundation does need to continue to sponsor curriculum innovation so that these choices can continually be updated and expanded. In short, we feel that we succeeded in our goal as a curriculum project. We feel strongly that there need to be more diverse types of activities in order to insure that any curriculum innovation will have its maximum impact in promoting educational change in the schools and in training students to be more effective citizens in an increasingly complex and interdependent world.

APPENDIX A

Project Staff

Directors

American Political Science Association - Evron Kirkpatrick

American Political Science Association - Pre-Collegiate Committee

Howard D. Mehlinger

Richard C. Snyder

Social Studies Development Center - Judith A. Gillespie

Howard D. Mehlinger

John J. Patrick

Developers

Robert Hanvey

Stuart Lazarus

Jean Wagner

B'Ann Wright

Evaluation

Samuel Christie

National Evaluation Systems - Richard Allen

Sherry Rubenstein

Audio-Visual

Martin Heltai - audio tape production

Joel Pett - graphic production

Steve Snyder - graphic production

Grace M. Starcke - photography

Nina Thayer - graphic production

Graduate Assistants

Ron Banaszak - development

Janet Eyler - development

Lynn Fontana - development

David Lambert - evaluation

Lee Morganette - evaluation

Ron Pahl - development

Ellen Sampson - research, development

Martin Sampson - pilot school linkage, development

Bruce Smith - development

Michael Charles Stentz - evaluation

Teacher Associates

Patricia Basa - review, pilot school visits

Regis Birckbichler - review, pilot school visits

Edward Brennan - review, pilot school visits

Tom Castellano - review

Tony Cadianni - review, pilot school visits

David Horst - review

Richard Kraft - review, pilot school visits

David Victor - review, pilot school visits

Site Consultants - Political Issues Course

Bruce Boyens

Jane Feldman

Patricia Hummell

Dan McConnell

Site Consultants, continued

John O'Connor

Charles W. Smyth, Jr.

Michael Viera

Matt Witt

Pilot Teachers

Mr. Douglas Aikin
Beaumont High School
3835 Natural Bridge
St. Louis, Missouri

Mr. John Armenia
Ocosta Senior High School
Westport, Washington 98595

Ms. Susan Beattie
Wichita North High School
1437 Rochester
Wichita, Kansas 67203

Mr. Ralph Bedwell
Broad Ripple High School
1115 East Broad Ripple Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46220

Mr. Leon Biren
Rio Americano High School
4540 American River Drive
Sacramento, California 95825

Ms. Diane Bolling
Roxbury High School
335 Greenville
Boston, Massachusetts

Mr. David Bonnette
Frontier High School
Route 2, Box 45
New Matamoras, Ohio 45767

Mr. Herbert Brodsky
August Martin High School
156-10 Baisley Boulevard
Jamaica, New York 11434

Pilot Teachers, continued

Brother Clement Burger
Holy Trinity High School
1443 West Division Street
Chicago, Illinois 60622

Mr. Tom Castellano
Clyde-Savannah High School
215 Glasgow Street
Clyde, New York 14433

Mr. Tom Coats
South Dade Senior High School
24801 S.W. 167th Avenue
Homestead, Florida 33030

Mr. Bob Cook
Rio Americano High School
4540 American River Drive
Sacramento, California 95825

Ms. Diana Cubbage
Wichita High School North
1437 Rochester
Wichita, Kansas 67203

Mr. William Daley
Kellam High School
RFD 2, Box 2010
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456

Ms. Judith Elliot
Annadale High School
47400 Medford Drive
Annadale, Virginia 22003

Mr. Clifford Floyd and Mr. Raul Theriault
Westminster High School
6980 Raleigh Street
Westminster, Colorado 80030

Mr. Carl Frederick
Eastern High School
17th and E. Capitol Streets, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Ms. Gail Funk
Newark High School
East Delaware Avenue
Newark, Delaware 19711

Pilot Teachers, continued

Mr. Tony Gauthier
Lawrence High School
19th and Louisiana Streets
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Ms. Rosemary Gindhart
Delta High School
Rural Route #1
Muncie, Indiana 47302

Mr. Charles Gordon
Fremont Senior High School
1750 North Lincoln Avenue
Fremont, Nebraska 68025

Mr. Stephen M. Gudac
Coolidge Senior High School
5th at Tuckerman Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20011

Mr. Ira Hiberman
South Carrol Senior High
1300 West Old Liberty Road
Sykesville, Maryland 21784

Mr. Jim Higgins
Magruder High School
5939 Muncaster Mill Road
Rockville, Maryland 20855

Ms. Betty Hinton
Rio Grande High School
2300 Arenal Street, S.W.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87101

Mr. Doug Jenisch
Hanover High School
Lebanon Street
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755

Mr. Roscoe Keeney
East Bank High School
East Bank, West Virginia 25167

Mr. Harold Keller
Central Catholic High School
1403 North St. Mary's
San Antonio, Texas 78215

Pilot Teachers, continued

Ms. Helen Kiok
John Bowne High School
6325 Main Street
Flushing, New York 11367

Mr. Richard F. Kraft
Los Altos High School
15321 E. Los Roblos Avenue
Hacienda Heights, California 91745

Mr. James Kroll
Milwaukee Trade and Technical High School
319 West Virginia Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53204

Mr. Tony Leonelli
The Rayen School
250 Bonita Avenue
Youngstown, Ohio 44540

Mrs. Shirley S. Mantio
Fenger High School
11220 South Wallace
Chicago, Illinois 60628

Mrs. Linda Matarrese
East High School
1545 Detroit Street
Denver, Colorado 80206

Mr. Frank Miles
Hanover High School
Lebanon Street
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755

Mr. Thomas Moody
Newport Harbor High School
600 Irvine
Newport Beach, California 92660

Mr. Tom Obrecht and Ms. Rachel Gragg
North High School
1550 Third Street
Riverside, California 92507

Mr. John O'Connor
Hyde Park High School
655 Metropolitan Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02136

Pilot Teachers, continued

Mr. Steven Prigohzy
Friends School in Detroit
1100 St. Aubin
Detroit, Michigan 48207

Miss Fern Robertson
Central High School
3616 North Garrison Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63107

Mr. Richard Saul
The Rayen School
250 Bonita Avenue
Youngstown, Ohio 44504

Mr. Richard Schwersing
North Glenn High School
601 West 100th Place
Denver, Colorado 80221

Mr. Robert Shillingstad
Capital High School
100 Valley Drive
Helena, Montana 59601

Mr. Maurice Tandler
Samuel J. Tilden High School
Tilden Avenue and East 57th Street
Brooklyn, New York 11203

Ms. Gayle Thieman
North Glenn High School
601 West 100th Place
Denver, Colorado 80221

Mr. Dennis Verstynen
Rio Grande High School
2300 Arenal Street, S.W.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87101

Mr. David Victor
Lake Park High School
6N 600 Medinah
Itasca, Illinois

Ms. Sara R. Vincent
Elbert County High School
Forest Avenue
Elberton, Georgia 30635

Pilot Teachers, continued

Ms. Marge Whatley
Contemporary Learning Center
Houston Independent School District
4100 Chartres Street
Houston, Texas 77004

Mrs. Elise Whyte
Anacostia High School
16th and R Streets, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20020

Mr. Gene Wilhoit
Bloomington High School North
3901 Kinser Pike
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Mr. Roger Williams
Trevor G. Browne High School
7402 West Catalina
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Consultants - Political Scientists

Manuel Aldana, Department of Political Science, Bishop College

Richard Allen, National Evaluation Systems, Amherst, Massachusetts

Ron Althouse, Department of Sociology, West Virginia University

Lee Anderson, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University

Eva Aronfreed, Department of Political Science, Glasboro State College

Harold Barger, Department of Political Science, Trinity University

Fred Bartle, Chairperson, Department of Political Science, SUNY

Harold Basehart, Department of History and Political Science, Salisbury State College

D.E. Baumgartner, Department of Political Science, Bucknell University

Robert Becker, Department of Political Science, Glasboro State College

Consultants, continued

Donald Baxter, Dept. of Government, College of William and Mary

Gwendolyn Carter, Dept. of Political Science, Indiana University

Cleo Cherryholmes, Dept. of Political Science, Michigan State University

James Christoph, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, Indiana University

R.J. Clark, Politics Department, University of Western Ontario

David Collier, Dept. of Political Science, Indiana University

Winston Cox, Dept. of Political Science, Howard University

Virginia Currey, Dept. of Political Science, Southern Methodist University

Paul DeLespinassee, Dept. of Political Science, Adrian College

Ellen Dewey, Dept. of Political Science, Bellevue College

Alfred Diamant, Dept. of Political Science, Indiana University

Larry Dickens, Government Dept., Sam Houston State University

Elbert DuBose, Dept. of Political Science, University of Oklahoma

Maurice East, Dept. of Political Science, University of Kentucky

David Easton, Dept. of Political Science, University of Chicago

Laurily Epstein, Dept. of Political Science, Washington University

Daryl Fair, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, Trenton State College

Edwin Fogelman, Dept. of Political Science, University of Minnesota

John Foster, Dept. of Political Science, Georgia State University

Anne Freedman, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, Roosevelt University

Norman Furniss, Dept. of Political Science, Indiana University

F. Chris Garcia, Dept. of Political Science, University of New Mexico

Consultants, continued

T.C. Geary, Dept. of Government, University of South Dakota

John Gillespie, Director, Center for International Policy Studies, Indiana University

John Gillespie, Department of Political Science, University of Toledo

Fred Greenstein, Chairperson, Dept. of Government, Wesleyan University

Gary Greinke, Political Science Dept., Concordia Teachers College

Harold Guetzkow, Dept. of Political Science, Northwestern University

James Hartnett, Chairperson, Dept. of History and Political Science, Delaware State College

Willis Hawley, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University

David Hazel, Dept. of Political Science, Central State University of Ohio

Richard Heiges, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Ralph Hemphill, Dept. of Political Science, Georgia College

Barry Hughes, Dept. of Political Science, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

Harold Jacobson, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, University of Michigan

Wayne Johnson, Dept. of Political Science, Stephen F. Austin State University

Charles Jones, Dept. of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh

Ruth Jones, Dept. of Political Science, University of Missouri--St. Louis

Evron Kirkpatrick, Executive Director, American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Sheilah Koeppen, American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Bernard Kolasa, Dept. of Political Science, University of Nebraska

Consultants, continued

Samuel Krislov, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, University of Minnesota

James Kweder, Dept. of Political Science, Cleveland State University

Antonio Lapitan, Dept. of Political Science, University of Dayton

Carl Lieberman, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, Akron University

Sarah Liebschutz, Dept. of Political Science, SUNY at Brockport

Martin Lipset, Dept. of Political Science, Stanford University

Ronald Loveridge, Dept. of Political Science, University of California, Riverside

Tom Mann, American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Mary Mattingly, Chairperson, Dept. of Government, Texas A & I University

James McKenny, Dept. of Political Science, Wichita State University

Les McLemore, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, Jackson State College

Richard Merelman, Dept. of Political Science, University of Wisconsin

Richard Merritt, Dept. of Political Science, University of Illinois

David Minar, Dept. of Political Science, Northwestern University

Orvill Minard, Dept. of Political Science, University of Nebraska

Manindra Mohapatra, Dept. of Politics, Old Dominion University

David S. Myers, Faculty of Political Science, University of West Florida

James Nathan, Dept. of Political Science, University of Delaware

Betty Nesvold, Dept. of Political Science, San Diego State University

William Nichols, Dept. of Political Science, Westminster College

Norma Noonan, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, Augsburg College

Lillian F. Noyes, Dept. of Political Science, Pan American University

Consultants, continued

Francis Ogene, Dept. of Political Science, Central State University

Joe Olander, Dept. of Political Science, Florida International University

David Olson, Dept. of Political Science, University of Washington

Patrick O'Meara, Dept. of Political Science, Indiana University

Elinor Ostrom, Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University

Niel Palumbo, Dept. of Economics, West Virginia University

John Peterson, Dept. of Government, Western Kentucky University

J.D. Phaup, Dept. of Political Science, Texas A & I University

Jewel Prestage, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, Southern University

Kenneth Prewitt, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, University of Chicago

John Ramsey, Dept. of Political Science, Old Dominion University

Richard Reese, Dept. of Political Science, Carroll College

Leroy Rieselbach, Chairperson, Dept. of Political Science, Indiana University

Benjamin Rivlin, Dept. of Political Science, CUNY Graduate School

James Rosenau, Director, Institute for Transnational Studies, University of Southern California

Stanley Rothman, Dept. of Government, Smith College

John Rys, Dept. of Political Science, Montgomery Community College

Richard Saeger, Dept. of Political Science, Valdosta State College

Ann Schneider, Dept. of Political Science, University of Oregon

Richard Snyder, Director, Mershon Center, Ohio State University

Bruce Stinebrickner, Dept. of Political Science, Yale University

John Sullivan, Dept. of Political Science, University of Minnesota

Consultants, continued

James Svara, Dept. of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Henry Teune, Dept. of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania

Patrick Thomas, Dept. of Political Science, University of North Carolina

Gerald Thorpe, Dept. of Political Science, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Stuart Thorson, Dept. of Political Science, Ohio State University

Michael Viera, Dept. of Political Science, University of California, Riverside

Ronald Weber, Dept. of Political Science, Indiana University

Dennis Wiedman, Dept. of Political Science, Caroll College

Carolyn Sue Williams, Xavier University of Louisiana

Maurice Woodard, Dept. of Political Science, Howard University

Jack Woods, Dept. of Political Science, Texas A & M University

Harmon Zeigler, Director, Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon

Nancy Zingale, Dept. of Political Science, Lakewood Junior College

Consultants - Social Studies Educators

George Behlen, Dept. of History, Youngstown State University

Barry Beyer, Dept. of History, Carnegie-Mellon University

Loretta Carney, Dept. of Education, New York State College

William Coplin, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University

Donald Cunningham, College of Education, Indiana University

Stephen Daniels, School of Education, Texas Eastern University

Consultants, continued

Ivor Davies, College of Education, Indiana University

John Dority, New York State Education Department, Albany

Lee Ehman, Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University

David Eldredge, West Chester State College

Karen Fox, College of Education, Northwestern University

Edward Glab, Institute of Latin American Studies, University of Texas

William Gorth, National Evaluation Systems, Amherst, Massachusetts

Maurice Guysenir, Dept. of Secondary Education, Northeastern Illinois University

John Haas, College of Education, University of Colorado

John Haefner, Social Studies Education Dept., University of Iowa

Michael Hartoonian, Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin

Mary Hepburn, Dept. of Social Science Education, University of Georgia

Ray Hiner, School of Education, University of Kansas

Robert Jewitt, College of Education, Ohio State University

Ted Kaltsounis, College of Education, University of Washington

Morris Lewenstein, Dept. of Social Science, California State University, San Francisco

Jack Lowry, Dept. of Education, University of California, Davis

Jack Lundstrom, College of Education, Florida State University

Nona Lyons, Educational Development Center, Boston, Massachusetts

Peter Martorella, Social Studies Dept., Temple University

Harvard McLean, Social Studies Dept., Miami University

Willis Moreland, Dept. of Social Education, University of Nebraska

Consultants, continued

Raymond Muessig, College of Education, Ohio State University

Jack Newhouse, State Dept. of Education, Charleston, West Virginia

Fred Newmann, College of Education, University of Wisconsin

Richard Newton, Social Studies Dept., Temple University

Anna Ochoa, College of Education, Florida State University

James Okey, College of Education, University of Georgia

Gary Orfield, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Jim Oswald, Intercultural Studies Program, American Universities Field Staff

Tony Penna, Dept. of History, Carnegie-Mellon University

William Pulliam, Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Delaware

Richard Remy, Mershon Center, Ohio State University

Linda Scher, Ginn and Company

James Shaver, College of Education, Utah State University

Richard Simms, Education Dept., North Texas State University

Jack Simpson, Chairperson, Social Studies Dept., University of Wisconsin

Harry Stein, Dept. of Education, State of New Jersey

George Stoumbis, Dept. of Secondary Education, University of New Mexico

William Thrasher, Law and Education Center, Harvard University

Judith Torney, Dept. of Psychology, University of Illinois--Chicago Circle

Jan Tucker, College of Education, Florida International University

Ronald Urick, Dept. of Interdisciplinary Teacher Education, Wayne State University

Consultants, continued

Thomas Volgy, Dept. of Government, University of Arizona

David Weitzman, Covela, California

Rubin Weston, Chairperson, Social Studies Dept., Central State University

Karen Wiley, Social Science Education Consortium, Boulder, Colorado

Larry Wills, Social Studies Dept., Bowling Green State University

Peter Wilson, Social Studies Dept., Ohio State University

Edward Wynne, College of Education, University of Illinois--Chicago Circle

Ethnic Review Panel

Rose Fernandez, Albuquerque, New Mexico-- Mexican American

Kevin Locke, Vermillion, South Dakota -- Native American

Leo Macias, University of New Mexico -- Mexican American

Inez Smith Reid, Barnard College -- Black American

Leland Shimada, El Cerrito, California -- Asian American

Parent Reviewers

Bettye F. Collins, Birmingham, Alabama

DeJeanne Commeau, Arlington, Virginia

APPENDIX B
Activities Completed by the Project

Major Activities or Events of HSPSCP	1972 1	2	3	4	1973 1	2	3	4	1974 1	2	3	4	1975 1	2	3	4	1976 1	2	3	4	1977 1	2	3	4	1978 1	2	3	4	'79 1	2
1. Conceptualization																														
Needs Assessment	.	X	X	X																										
Testing of Alternative Conceptualizations	.	X	X	X																										
Preparation, Critique and Publication of Conceptualization Paper	.	.	.	X	X	X	X	X	X																					
2. Instructional Materials Development																														
Development of Prototypes	.	.	.	X	X	X	X	X	X																					
Field Test of Prototypes	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X	X																				
Development of Political Systems Course	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X																			
Field Test of Political Systems Course	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X																	
Revision of Political Systems Course	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X															
Field Test of Revised Political Systems Course	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X													
Development of Political Issues Course	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X	X															
Field Test of Political Issues Course	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X													
Revision of Political Issues Course	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X													
Field Test of Revised Political Issues Course	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X												
Revision of Both Semesters for Publication (See #5 below)	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X	X	X								
Development of Teacher Training Program	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X	X								
3. Evaluation																														
Critical Review of Products	.	.	.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								
Selection of Pilot Schools	.	.	.	.	X	X			X	X			X	X																
Formative Evaluation of Instructional Materials	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												
Validation of Instructional Materials	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X											
4. Diffusion																														
Publication of Articles and Books about Projects*	.	.	.	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Consultations with Other Organizations*	.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Presentations to Professional Meetings*	.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Teacher Institutes*	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X			X	X															
Presentations to Adoption Committee	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X		
Installation of Product in Schools	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X
5. Publication of Comparing Political Experiences																														
Publisher Conferences	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X				X															
Provide Specifications Leading to Publisher Bids	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X													
Accept and Choose Among Publisher Bids	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X												
Work on Final Version For Publisher	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X	X	X								
Production of Commercial Version	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X	X				
Advance Copies of CPE Available	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X			
CPE Available for Sale	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X	X	X

*X represents an article, book, meeting or talk that has been either completed or has been assured.

APPENDIX C

Curriculum Materials

Prototypes

1. Decide!
2. The Walkout
3. Political Influence
4. Survey Research
5. Choices and Bargains
6. Making Political Decisions
7. Know Your Decision Rules
8. High School Confidential
9. Patterns of Political Development

Comparing Political Experiences - First Experimental Version

Unit 1 - Politics Here and Now
Unit 2 - Political Resources
Unit 3 - Political Activities
Unit 4 - Four Political Experiences

Comparing Political Experiences - Second Experimental Version

Political Systems	Political Issues
Unit 1 - Observing Political Systems	Save the System
Unit 2 - Using Political Resources	Busing In Boston
Unit 3 - Participating in Political Activities	Clean Air Now
	Union Underground
	Jobs and Engines
	Political Issues Skills Kit

Audio Visual Materials

Game Packet for Decide!
Audio Tape for The Walkout
Data Packet for Survey Research
Gaming Kit for Choices and Bargains
Transparency Packet for Patterns of Political Development
Slide Tape "A Systemic View of Politics" for Politics Here and Now
Political Systems Puzzle for Political Activities
Decide Game for Political Activities
Audio Tape "Walkout" for Four Political Experiences
Transparency Set for Four Political Experiences
Decide Game for Observing Political Systems
Audio Tape "Walkout" for Observing Political Systems
Slide Tape "A Systemic View of Politics for Observing Political Systems

Audio Visual Materials, continued

Audio Tape "Eleven Million New Voters" for Using Political Resources
Audio Tape "Who Runs the Chicago Police Department" for Using Political Resources
Slide Tape "Chhatera: A Village In India" in Participating in Political Activities
Audio Tape "All Those Arrested" for Busing In Boston
Data Packet for Busing In Boston
Audio Tape "A View From the Top" in Clean Air Now
Data Packet for Clean Air Now
Slide Tape "Work At the Face - Parts I and II" for Union Underground
Audio Tape "The People Who Work Here" for Jobs and Engines

APPENDIX D

Pilot Schools

Beaumont High School
3835 Natural Bridge
St. Louis, Missouri

Ocosta Senior High School
Westport, Washington 98595

Wichita North High School
1437 Rochester
Wichita, Kansas 67203

Broad Ripple High School
1115 East Broad Ripple Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46220

Rio Americano High School
4540 American River Drive
Sacramento, California 95825

Roxbury High School
335 Greenville
Boston, Massachusetts

Frontier High School
Route 2, Box 45
New Matamoras, Ohio 45767

August Martin High School
156-10 Baisley Boulevard
Jamaica, New York 11434

Holy Trinity High School
1443 West Division Street
Chicago, Illinois 60622

Clyde-Savannah High School
215 Glasgow Street
Clyde, New York 14433

South Dade Senior High School
24801 S.W. 167th Avenue
Homestead, Florida 33030

Kellam High School
RFD 2, Box 2010
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456

Annadale High School
47400 Medford Drive
Annadale, Virginia 22003

Westminster High School
6980 Raleigh Street
Westminster, CO 80030

Eastern High School
17th and E. Capitol N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Newark High School
East Delaware Avenue
Newark, Delaware 19711

Lawrence High School
19th and Louisiana Sts.
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Delta High School
Rural Route #1
Muncie, Indiana 47302

Fremont Senior High School
1750 N. Lincoln Avenue
Fremont, Nebraska 68025

Coolidge Senior High School
5th at Tuckerman Sts., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20011

South Carrol Senior High
1300 W. Old Liberty Road
Sykesville, Maryland 21784

Magruder High School
5939 Muncaster Mill Rd.
Rockville, Maryland 20855

Rio Grande High School
2300 Arenal St. S.W.
Albuquerque, NM 87101

Hanover High School
Lebanon Street
Hanover, NH 03755

East Bank High School
East Bank, WV 25167

Central Catholic High School
1403 North St. Mary's
San Antonio, TX 78215

Pilot Schools, continued

John Bowne High School
6325 Main Street
Flushing, New York 11367

Los Altos High School
15321 E. Los Roblos Avenue
Hacienda Heights, CA 91745

Milwaukee Trade and Technical
High School
319 W. Virginia Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53204

The Rayen School
250 Bonita Avenue
Youngstown, Ohio 44540

Fenger High School
11220 South Wallace
Chicago, Illinois 60628

East High School
1545 Detroit Street
Denver, Colorado 80206

Newport Harbor High School
600 Irvine
Newport Beach, CA 92660

North High School
1550 Third Street
Riverside, CA 92507

Hyde Park High School
655 Metropolitan Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02136

Friends School in Detroit
1100 St. Aubin
Detroit, Michigan 48207

Central High School
3616 N. Garrison Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63107

North Glenn High School
601 West 100th Place
Denver, Colorado 80221

Capital High School
100 Valley Drive
Helena, Montana 59601

Samuel J. Tilden High School
Tilden Ave. and E. 57th St.
Brooklyn, New York 11203

Lake Park High School
6N 600 Medinah
Itasca, Illinois

Elbert County High School
Forest Avenue
Elberton, Georgia 30635

Houston Independent School
District
4100 Chartres Street
Houston, Texas 77004

Anacostia High School
16th and R Streets, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20020

Bloomington High School
North
3901 Kinser Pike
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Trevor G. Browne High School
7402 West Catalina
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

APPENDIX E

Evaluation Instruments and Reports

Pilot Teacher Background Questionnaire

Student Data Inventory

Differential Aptitude Test - Verbal and Numerical Reasoning
(Forms S and T)

Political Attitude and Opinion Questionnaire
(Pre and Post forms)

Political Understanding Test

Mastery Tests for Comparing Political Experiences -
1 Semester Course

Mastery Test for: Politics and You
Mastery Test for: Political Resources
Mastery Test for: Political Activities
Mastery Test for: Four Political Experiences

Mastery Tests for Comparing Political Experiences -
Political Systems and Political Issues

All mastery tests and reports for units below completed by National Evaluation Systems, Amherst, Massachusetts.

Mastery Test for: Observing Political Systems
Report of mastery test results

Mastery Test for: Using Political Resources
Report of mastery test results

Mastery Test for: Participating in Political Activities
Report of mastery test results

Mastery Test for: Save the System
Report of mastery test results

Mastery Test for: Busing In Boston
Report of mastery test results

Mastery Test for: Clean Air Now
Report of mastery test results

Mastery Test for: Union Underground
Report of mastery test results

Mastery Test for: Jobs and Engines
Report of mastery test results

Reaction Questionnaires

Student Reaction Questionnaires for Observing Political Systems
Teacher Reaction Questionnaires for Observing Political Systems
Report of Student and Teacher Reactions

Student Reaction Questionnaires for Using Political Resources
Teacher Reaction Questionnaires for Using Political Resources
Report of Student and Teacher Reactions

Student Reaction Questionnaires for Participating in Political Activities
Teacher Reaction Questionnaires for Participating in Political Activities
Report of Student and Teacher Reactions

Student Reaction Questionnaires for Save the System
Teacher Reaction Questionnaires for Save the System
Report of Student and Teacher Reactions

Student Reaction Questionnaires for Busing In Boston
Teacher Reaction Questionnaires for Busing In Boston
Report of Student and Teacher Reactions

Student Reaction Questionnaires for Clean Air Now
Teacher Reaction Questionnaires for Clean Air Now
Report of Student and Teacher Reactions

Student Reaction Questionnaires for Union Underground
Teacher Reaction Questionnaires for Union Underground
Report of Student and Teacher Reactions

Student Reaction Questionnaires for Jobs and Engines
Teacher Reaction Questionnaires for Jobs and Engines
Report of Student and Teacher Reactions

General Achievement Tests

Five General Achievement Tests were developed by National Evaluation Systems for administration throughout the year.

General Achievement Test 1
General Achievement Test 2
General Achievement Test 3
General Achievement Test 4
General Achievement Test 5

List of High School Political Science Curriculum Project Publications

1. Judith A. Gillespie and Howard D. Mehlinger, "Teach About Politics in the 'Real' World -- The School," Social Education, Vol. 39, No. 6 (October, 1972), pp. 598-603, 644.

2. Judith A. Gillespie, "Using the School as a Political Laboratory for Civics and Government Instruction," Minnesota Council for the Social Studies Journal (Fall, 1972), pp. 5-9.

3. Judith A. Gillespie, "Instructional Uses of School Political Experiences," Newsletter of the Social Science Education Consortium (November, 1972).

4. Howard Mehlinger, "Political Science," New York Times Education Supplement, (January 18, 1973).

5. Judith A. Gillespie and John J. Patrick, Comparing Political Experiences: An Alternative Program for High School Government Instruction, Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association, 1974.

6. Judith A. Gillespie, "Pre-Collegiate Education News," DEA News, Vol. 1 (Winter, 1974).

7. _____, "Comparing Political Experiences: Reflection of Field Experiences," P.S. (Winter, 1974).

8. Howard D. Mehlinger, "Social Studies -- Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," Today's Education, Vol. 63, No. 2 (March/April, 1974), pp. 66-70.

9. Judith A. Gillespie, "Power and Participation in the Student Community." Paper delivered at the David W. Minar Memorial Conference, Northwestern University, Evanston, (October, 1974).

10. Judith A. Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus, "Political Issues: An Overview," High School Political Science Curriculum Project, Social Studies Development Center, January, 1975.

11. "Teacher Associates: Indiana University," Newsletter of the Social Science Education Consortium, No. 21, (February, 1975), p. 2.

12. Judith A. Gillespie and John J. Patrick, "Not Another Textbook: Developing and Evaluating Instructional Materials in a High School Political Education Project," Teaching Political Science, Vol. 2, No. 3, (April, 1975), pp. 237-255.

13. Judith A. Gillespie, "The American Government Course: Relationships Between High School and College Instruction," Teaching Political Science, (July, 1975).

14. CPE Project Review, News Supplement of the DEA News, No. 6, (Summer, 1975), pp. S-1 - S-8.

15. Judith A. Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus, "Controversial Political Issues: Providing the Participant's Eye View." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Atlanta, Georgia, November 25-28, 1975.

16. Judith A. Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus, "Teaching Political Participation Skills," Social Education, November, 1976.

17. Judith A. Gillespie, "Political Science, Political Participation and the Secondary School Curriculum," History and Social Science Teacher, 2:3, Spring, 1976.

18. Judith A. Gillespie, "Comparing Political Experiences," Political Education in the USA, Bundezentrale für Politische Bildung, 1977.

19. Judith Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus, "Political Climates and the Diffusion of Innovative Instructional Materials," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Cincinnati, Ohio, November 22-27, 1977.

20. Judith Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus, American Government: Comparing Political Experiences, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., forthcoming in 1979.

Publications Containing References to
Comparing Political Experiences

21. "Frontier Shares in Developing Program to Teach Government," Marietta Daily Times, (January, 1974).

22. "Rayen Teacher Guest Speaker for Gammi Pi," Youngstown Vindicator, (October 17, 1974), p. 41.

23. Fred M. Newmann, Education for Citizen Action: Challenge for Secondary Curriculum. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975, p. 5n.

24. George Lane, "Plan for Citizens' Police-Complaint Board Set Back," The Denver Post, (March 12, 1975), p. 21.

25. "High School Teacher Attends Workshop," Fremont Tribune, (August 12, 1975).

26. Announcement of the Comparing Political Experiences Diffusion Project Conference, Newsletter of the Social Science Education Consortium, No. 23, (September, 1975), p. 4.

27. Byron G. Massialas, "Political Participation in School Life: A New Thrust for Social Studies," The Georgia Social Science Journal, Vol. VII, No. 1, (Fall, 1975), pp. 1-12.

28. Forbes Bottomly, "Political Participation in School Life: An Administrator's Look at the Massialas Idea," The Georgia Social Science Journal, Vol. VII, No. 1, (Fall, 1975), pp. 13-19.

29. John J. Patrick and H. David Lambert, "Evaluation in the High School Political Science Curriculum Project," High School Political Science Curriculum Project, Social Studies Development Center, Spring, 1975.

List of Presentations about the High School Political Science Curriculum Project by Staff

1. Minnesota Council for the Social Studies, Minneapolis, April 15, 1972.
2. Midwest International Studies Association, Toronto, May, 1972.
3. Social Science Education Consortium, Denver, June 8-11, 1972.
4. City University of New York, New York, July, 1972.
5. Institute on Teaching about Politics in Schools, Indiana University, August 10, 1972.
6. Law in a Free Society Conference, San Francisco, August 21-22, 1972.
7. American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., September 5-8, 1972.
8. Texas Council for the Social Studies, Corpus Christi, September 27, 1972.
9. Utah State Education Association, Salt Lake City, September 29, 1972.
10. Oklahoma Council for the Social Studies, Oklahoma City, October 19, 1972.
11. Florida Council for the Social Studies, Tampa, October 21, 1972.
12. Southern Ohio Council for the Social Studies, Cincinnati, October 26, 1972.
13. Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, November 3, 1972.
14. Indiana State Teacher's Association, Muncie, November 3, 1972.
15. National Council for the Social Studies, Boston, November 23, 1972.
16. International Studies Association Consortium, November 29, 1972.
17. Orange County Council for the Social Studies, Los Angeles, December 2, 1972.
18. International Studies Association Meeting, New York, March 13-16, 1973.
19. Indiana Council for the Social Studies, Terre Haute, March 30-31, 1973.
20. Mid-Hudson Social Studies Conference, New Paltz, New York, March 31, 1973.

21. National Council for the Social Studies Regional Meeting, Durham, North Carolina, April 5, 1973.

22. Colorado Council for the Social Studies, Denver, April 27-28, 1973.

23. Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, May 3-5, 1973.

24. Michigan State Conference on Social Education, East Lansing, May 11-12, 1973.

25. Connecticut Council for the Social Studies, May 11, 1973.

26. Political Education Institute, Trinity University, June 13-15, 1973.

27. Institute for Participation and Instruction, Mershon Center, Columbus, Ohio, June 17-19 and July 2-4, 1973.

28. American Bar Association Law-Related Education Meeting, Chicago, June 29, 1973.

29. NSF Resource Personnel Workshop, Indiana University, July 20, 1973.

30. Taft Institute on Government, Indiana State University, July 22, 1973.

31. NSF Resource Personnel Workshop, Morris, Minnesota, August 9, 1973.

32. American Political Science Association Meetings, September 4-8, 1973.

33. Meetings of APSA Education Committees, October 18-20, 1973.

34. National Council for the Social Studies Meetings, November 20-24, 1973.

35. American Political Science Association Pre-Collegiate Education Meetings, Columbus, April 10-12, 1974.

36. American Political Science Association Convention, Chicago, August 27-September 2, 1974.

37. National Conference on Citizenship, Washington, D.C., September 14, 1974.

38. Kansas Council for the Social Studies Convention, Wichita, October 31, 1974.

39. National Council for the Social Studies Meetings, Chicago, November 26-29, 1974.

40. American Political Science Pre-Collegiate Committee Meeting, Phoenix, January 6-8, 1975.

41. University of Illinois Joint Political Science and Social Studies Meeting, Champaign-Urbana, January 10, 1975.

42. International Studies Association Meeting, St. Louis, February 20-22, 1975.

43. California Council for the Social Studies Meeting, Sacramento, March 13-16, 1975.

44. American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, Chicago, March 23, 1975.

45. National Council for the Social Studies Regional Meeting, Boston, April 3-5, 1975.

46. New York Council for the Social Studies Meeting, Nevele, April 13-15, 1975.

47. Ohio Council for the Social Studies, Kent, April 18, 1975.

48. Middle States Regional Social Studies Council Meeting, Philadelphia, April 18-19, 1975.

49. National Council for the Social Studies Southeast Regional Meeting, Virginia Beach, Virginia, April 24-26, 1975.

50. Law Related Education Conference, Chicago, May 7, 1975.

51. National Science Foundation Implementation Workshop in International Education, University of Denver, June 16-17, 1975.

52. Taft Institute on Government, Trinity University, June 30-July 2, 1975.

53. National Science Foundation Curriculum Workshop, University of Arkansas, Jonesboro, July 9-10, 1975.

54. National Science Foundation Resource Personnel Workshop, Boston, July 18, 1975.

55. Robert Taft Institute, University of Southern Illinois at Carbondale, July 18, 1975.

56. Minnesota National Science Foundation Resource Personnel Workshop, Morris, Minnesota, August 13-14, 1975.

57. Taft Institute on Government, George Washington University, Washington, D.C., August 22, 1975.

58. American Political Science Association Meetings, San Francisco, August 31-September 5, 1975.

59. German-American Conference on Political Education, Indiana University, September 15-19, 1975.

60. Social Studies Department Chairmen Meeting, Virginia Beach, Virginia, September 25, 1975.

61. Newark Diffusion Conference, Newark, September 28-30, 1975.

62. Legal Education Conference of the American Bar Association, Richmond, October 3-4, 1975.

63. Institute for Political and Legal Education Meeting on Law Focused Education, Springfield, Illinois, October 8-9, 1975.

64. Cleveland Social Studies Council, Cleveland, October 10, 1975.

65. Oakland Intermediate School District, Oakland, Michigan, October 22, 1975.

66. Michigan Conference of Political Scientists, East Lansing, October 23-24, 1975.

67. Nebraska Teacher's Association Annual Meeting, Wayne State Teacher's College, Wayne, October 23-24, 1975.

68. Wyoming Social Studies Convention, Laramie, October 24, 1975.

69. Columbus Diffusion Conference, Columbus, October 26-28, 1975.

70. San Antonio Diffusion Conference, November 2-4, 1975.

71. Comparing Political Experiences Publisher's Conference, Indiana University, November 5, 1975.

72. National Council for the Social Studies Annual Meeting, Atlanta, November 24-28, 1975.

73. American Political Science Association Pre-Collegiate Committee Meeting, New Orleans, January 8-9, 1976.

74. International Studies Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, February 25-28, 1976.

75. California Diffusion Conference, San Francisco, February 29-March 1, 1976.

76. California Council for the Social Studies Meeting, Los Angeles, March 18-21, 1976.

77. National Council for the Social Studies Regional Meeting, Indianapolis, March 18-20, 1976.

78. National Council for the Social Studies Northeast Regional Meeting, Boston, April 1-3, 1976.

79. National Council for the Social Studies Southeast Regional Meeting, New Orleans, April 8-10, 1976.

80. International Studies Association Midwest Meetings, Bloomington, May 20-21, 1976.

81. Social Science Education Consortium Meetings, Denver, June 11-12, 1976.

82. International Studies Institute, Pittsburgh, June 25-26, 1976.

83. American Political Science Association Meetings, Chicago, September 2-5, 1976.

84. U.S. Office of Education Citizenship Conference, Kansas City, September 20-24, 1976.

85. Airlie Diffusion Conference, Airlie, Virginia, October 31-November 2, 1976.

86. National Council for the Social Studies Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., November 2-6, 1976.

87. California Council for the Social Studies, San Francisco, March 4, 1977.

88. National Council for the Social Studies Northeast Regional Meeting, Boston, March 11, 1977.

89. International Studies Association Annual Meeting, St. Louis, March 19, 1977.

90. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Annual Meeting, Houston, March 21, 1977.

91. Indiana Council for the Social Studies, South Bend, March 25, 1977.

92. Southwest Social Science Association, Dallas, March 30, 1977.

93. American Educational Research Association Meetings, New York, April 4-8, 1977.

94. Eastern Community College Social Science Association, Pittsburgh, April 14, 1977.

95. Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 21, 1977.

96. National Council for the Social Studies, Midwest Regional Meeting, Omaha, April 21-23, 1977.

97. New York Council for the Social Studies, Grossinger's, April 25, 1977.

98. Social Science Education Consortium Meetings, Denver, June 10-11, 1977.

99. Citizen Education Alliance Meeting, Philadelphia, June 24-25, 1977.

100. American Political Science Association Meetings, Washington, August 30-September 4, 1977.

101. Virginia Council for the Social Studies, Charlottesville, October 28-29, 1977.

102. National Council for the Social Studies Annual Meeting, Cincinnati, November 23-27, 1977.

Future:

103. National Council for the Social Studies Northeast Regional Meeting, Boston, March 1-4, 1978.

104. California Council for the Social Studies, Los Angeles, March 10-12, 1978.

105. National Council for the Social Studies Southeast Regional Meeting, Orlando, March 30-April 1, 1978.

106. National Council for the Social Studies Midwest Regional Meeting, Minneapolis, April 13-15, 1978.

APPENDIX H

Bid Specifications and List of Publishers Contacted

Specifications for the Publication of the COMPARING POLITICAL EXPERIENCES Program

Comparing Political Experiences (CPE) is a product of the High School Political Science Curriculum Project. Since March, 1972, the National Science Foundation has provided $1,261,900 for the design, development, testing and diffusion of experimental versions of CPE. NSF approval is necessary for both the choice of publisher and the contract for publication. The American Political Science Association is the grantee institution for the project. The Association's Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education acts as the direct monitor of the work of the project. The Association will approve the publisher and will sign the contract for publication of the commercial version of CPE.

The Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University is the subcontractor of the Association's grant. Judith Gillespie, Howard Mehlinger and John Patrick co-direct the project. They are responsible for planning, development, evaluation and diffusion activities for the CPE course. All questions regarding bid specifications should be directed to the directors (tel. (812) 337-3838). Proposals for bids should be submitted to the following address:

Director
High School Political Science Curriculum Project
Social Studies Development Center
513 North Park Avenue
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Proposals are due on or before June 15, 1976.

The following criteria will serve as the primary focus for selecting a CPE publisher:

1) To what extent does the publisher have sufficient interest in innovation to fully support the publication of an alternative approach to civics and government instruction? How much experience does the publisher have in developing and marketing innovative instructional programs? If the publisher does not have prior experience, what is their rationale for taking on CPE?

2) To what degree will CPE be the publisher's principal thrust and interest in the area of twelfth-grade American government?

3) To what extent is the publisher's editorial and graphics capability innovative and of high quality? To what degree will that capability be committed to CPE?

4) How well-defined and creative are the publisher's packaging ideas for the course?

5) To what extent does the publisher's sales capability provide for maximum distribution of the project's materials?

6) To what degree is the publisher committed to the general goals and purposes of CPE?

7) Is the publisher an equal opportunity employer?

8) How adequate is the publisher's dissemination plan for CPE?

9) To what extent can the publisher meet the publication schedule planned for CPE?

Publisher's ideas are encouraged on many topics and they should elaborate on any points which they believe will strengthen their proposal.

Course Description

CPE is designed to be an alternative to twelfth grade government instruction in high schools. CPE consists of two semesters of material, Political Systems and Political Issues. The two semesters can either be used in sequence as a year-long course or they can be used independently. Political Systems is designed to serve as an alternative approach to standard American government courses of one semester's length. Political Issues aims to serve as an alternative approach for government electives such as Problems of Democracy.

CPE has been evaluated through three, independent rounds of field testing. In the 1973-74 school year, nine prototype units were tested. In the 1974-75 school year, the first version of the Political Systems course was tested in 24 schools across the nation. This year the revised Political Systems semester course and the first version of the Political Issues semester course are being taught in 35 schools. The schools include rural, suburban and urban environments with students from a variety of racial and socio-economic backgrounds. The courses are being taught both as a year-long sequence and as one semester options.

Throughout the field testing of the program the project staff has found that the course has worked effectively in upper high school grades. It has potential for use by many students with different abilities and interests as well as those with a variety of socio-economic and racial backgrounds. The project developers hope to aid the "average" citizen in gaining valuable information and skills.

Three-fourths of the CPE pilot teachers have attended training workshops. One-fourth have not had such training. Two pilot teacher workshops have been held. These workshops have not made a measurable difference in teacher performance with the materials and the program can be used without extensive teacher training. However, interest is high in continuing dissemination workshops and communication activities designed to inform a variety of audiences about the program.

Throughout the spring of this year, evaluation will continue. The staff is just beginning to process evaluation data and will use this information as a basis for needed revisions. It is important for a publisher to realize that the developers intend to do a full revision of both semesters of materials. There are major decisions which have yet to be made, and the developers are seeking publisher advice and cooperation in making many of these decisions.

The CPE staff has consistently worked to disseminate ideas and materials in order to prepare schools for a new approach to government instruction and to determine the current marketability of the course. CPE is designed as an alternative, but the developers continue to aim at use of the program in American government courses (Political Systems with or without Political Issues) and twelfth-grade electives such as Problems of Democracy (Political Issues). Project staff have attended conferences of social science professionals, social studies educators, school administrators and teachers. These audiences have been receptive to ideas of exploring political experiences and teaching participation skills. In addition to a nationwide network of pilot schools, over 200 affiliate schools are involved in some way in the project. The project also maintains a mailing list of over 800 professionals who are interested in the CPE program.

This year the project is also hosting six major diffusion conferences. Over 360 curriculum decision-makers have been invited to learn about CPE and give ideas and advice about the revision and implementation of the program. These decision-makers have been receptive to the program and are eager to work on dissemination and adoption problems. The project staff wishes to work with this constituency and expand it as the commercial version of the course is being produced.

Specific Course Materials

The course materials consist of nine units. All have been completely developed in an experimental version. There are three units which constitute the Political Systems semester. There is a short introductory module, four units and a skills kit for the Political Issues semester course. There are teacher's guides, tests, games, slides, transparencies, and audio-tapes which are an integral part of the program. Each of these items is described below.

Student Materials. The Political Systems course is composed of three units of material of approximately 700 total manuscript pages in length. These units are divided into activities, rather than lessons. An activity constitutes one or more lessons that are grouped together in a cluster. The length of the Political Systems course will be cut and divided into four units with a total of approximately 320 book pages. The material will contain narration, case studies, photographs, cartoons, exercises and charts. Many of the lessons require students to write in the text. These lessons can be moved to work sheets or other media which are more suitable for publication.

The Political Issues semester currently contains five units of material. There is an introductory cartoon of 24 pages. The cartoon is designed to provide necessary background information when the course is used independently of the Systems material. The cartoon "idea" is important to the developers, but the content and format of the cartoon will need to be revised. The bulk of the course is composed of four instructional units, each approximately 100 manuscript pages in length. There is also a Skills Kit composed of 350 manuscript pages. The Issues units contain narration, exercises, case material, cartoons, charts, and photographs. This material will be revised so that each unit does not exceed 64 book pages in length.

The Skills Kit is designed for flexible use across units. Teachers seem to like the choice of using different lessons for different ability students or for different purposes in the classroom. The Skills Kit could be bound separately. It could also be used for the entire course, rather than just the Issues semester. More evaluation data is needed to make this decision and the developers are open to suggestions from publishers about packaging this particular piece.

The Political Systems materials can be bound in one volume. The Political Issues materials have been developed as a cartoon and four separate units which can be used in any sequence. It is also possible to package the Political Issues course as a single volume. Certainly this decision will be made with concerns of the publisher taken into account.

Teacher's Guide. The teacher's guide for CPE consists of plans for each activity (set of lessons) in each unit. At present, there are eight separate teacher's guides. One teacher's guide of approximately 160 book pages will be developed for each semester course. The teacher's guides will contain an overall rationale for the units, activity plans, work sheets and other material needed for the course.

Tests. Mastery tests have been developed for each unit. Student exercises are used as intermediate checks on student learning. The current mastery tests have been designed by National Evaluation Systems. There are eight tests; three for the first semester and five for the second semester. Parallel forms of each of the eight tests will be developed so that students have two opportunities to demonstrate mastery of the materials. Each of the sixteen tests will have approximately 25 multiple-choice items. There will need to be considerable revision of the present tests.

Simulation-Games. Most of the role play exercises in the course are contained in the Skills Kit. The course stresses role play and simulation as a basis for training students in various participation roles and skills. There are four simulation-games which are presently packaged separately from the unit materials. Decide! and the Political Systems Puzzle are used in conjunction with the Systems course. Closing the Border and Strike! are used in the Political Issues course. The developers expect that these simulation-games will be packaged in the most economical way, blending the role play and gaming exercises into the Skills Kit or into individual units and teacher's guides to eliminate separate packaging. All of these simulation-games need to be revised.

Slides, Transparencies and Audio-Tapes. The CPE course contains many audio-visual components which are integral parts of the course. The audio-visual materials are indispensable instructional media for the types of students the developers want to reach with CPE. There are two slide sets, seven audio-tapes, and one transparency set presently included in the Political Systems course. There are five audio-tapes and one slide set presently contained in the Political Issues course. These materials are all experimental and will need to be revised for publication. While the specific tapes, transparency sets and slides may vary, the developers expect that at least two slide sets (75-80 slides), 4-6 audio-tapes (approx. 15 minutes each) and at least one set of transparencies 15-20 transparencies) will be produced for each semester. The slide sets, with accompanying tapes, may be transformed into filmstrips.

Factors to Consider the Proposals for Publication

Below are some points of information about Association and National Science Foundation requirements and considerations concerning the preparation of bids:

1) Bids will be received until June 15, 1976 at the Social Studies Development Center offices. The American Political Science Association will select and the National Science Foundation will approve the selection of a publisher. The selection of a publisher will be made on or before August 1, 1976.

2) The materials will carry a five-year, exclusive copyright to be held by APSA. After five years, the materials will be free-licensed by APSA in the English language to domestic persons of the United States and Canada.

3) The authorship team will consist of Judith Gillespie, Stuart Lazarus, and John Patrick. Judith Gillespie and John Patrick are primarily responsible for the development of the Political Systems course. Judith Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus are primarily responsible for the development of the Political Issues course. The authors plan to devote full time to transforming the materials for publication and to participate fully in subsequent revisions.

4) The publisher should provide a statement of interest in producing an innovative program and a particular rationale for desiring to publish CPE.

5) The publisher should indicate the royalty rate the company will pay. Royalties paid by the publisher will revert to the National Science Foundation.

6) The audio-visual materials will need to be completely revised for the commercial version of the CPE course. Permissions for photographs and other written materials will need to be procurred. The publisher should indicate plans for production of the audio-visual materials and for handling permissions.

7) The publisher should state how many editors will be involved in the program, their names and their particular expertise.

8) The publisher should describe other high school civics and government books the company is currently publishing and how they relate to the publication of the Comparing Political Experiences course.

9) The publisher should list any outside social studies consultants for the company and state what authority they have over the content of the company's products in social studies.

10) The course will need to be re-packaged. The publisher should demonstrate ways that CPE can be packaged in a high quality, flexible format while remaining at a competitive price.

11) There should be no need for financial support for the developers to complete development of the course during the period of publication. However, the current NSF grant runs out on June 30, 1976. A renewal grant is being submitted. The developers expect to know whether or not they will be supported before the announcement of a publisher is made in August. The renewal grant will terminate June 30, 1977. After that date, minimal post-grant administration costs will need to be borne by the publisher.

12) Publishers should submit ideas for dissemination activities. The pending NSF proposal contains ideas for dissemination for one full year, 1976-77. However, some publisher support will be necessary for dissemination in 1977-78. Publishers should address such questions as: How will the project continue to keep former pilot teachers, affiliate schools, interested curriculum decision-makers and others informed about the course? How will the publisher help to develop new interest? Can some type of newsletter, series of pamphlets or other media be maintained over this period?

13) The publisher should submit ideas about implementation of the program. Special in-service workshops may be necessary for schools to adopt CPE. The staff has been advised against a full-scale teacher education package that is expensive and used by only a few people. They have been encouraged to use the materials and perhaps some brief film or kit for in-service activities. The publisher should specify a plan for in-service training and how the company might contribute to it. Support for such activities is not likely to be forthcoming from the National Science Foundation.

14) The National Science Foundation requires that APSA provide in every publication, testing or distribution agreement involving instructional material developed under this grant (including, but not limited to teacher's manuals, text books, films, tapes or other supplementary instructional material) that such material will be made available within the school district using such material for inspection by parents or guardians of children engaged in educational programs or projects of that school district.

Schedule

The authors propose to make a full commitment to revision and publication of the program under the schedule stated below. We expect publishers to make some statement regarding their support or amendment of the schedule:

August 1, 1976	The choice of a publisher will be announced. Work will begin immediately on revisions for publication and developers will send individual units to the publisher as they are completed.
January 1, 1977	The developers will have completed revisions of the Political Systems students materials.
July 1, 1977	The developers will have completed revisions of the Political Issues student materials, all teacher materials and audio-visual materials.
June 1, 1978	Examination copies will be available for distribution to adoption committees and sales meetings.
January 1, 1979	Copyright.

1. Acropolis Books Ltd.
   Colortone Bldg.
   2400 17th St. N.W.
   Washington, D.C. 20009

2. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.
   Jacob Way
   Reading, Mass. 01867

3. Afro-Am Publishing
   1727 S. Indiana Ave.
   Chicago, Illinois 60616

4. Agathon Press, Inc.
   150 Fifth Ave.
   New York, New York 10011

5. AHM Publishing Corporation
   1500 Skokie Blvd.
   Northbrook, Ill. 60062

6. Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
   470 Atlantic Ave.
   Boston, Mass. 02210

7. American Book Company
   450 W. 33rd St.
   New York, N.Y. 10001

8. AMSCO School Publications, Inc.
   315 Hudson St.
   New York, N.Y. 10013

9. ARCO Publishing Company
   219 Park Ave. S.
   New York, N.Y. 10003

10. Auto Book Press
    1511 Grand Ave.
    San Marcos, Calif. 92069

11. Bantam Books, Inc.
    666 Fifth Ave.
    New York, N.Y. 10019

12. Barron's Educational Series, Inc.
    113 Crossways Park Dr.
    Woodbury, New York 11797

13. Beacon Press
25 Beacon St.
Boston, Mass. 02108

14. Behavioral Publications, Inc.
72 Fifth Ave.
New York, New York 10011

15. Benefic Press
10200 W. Roosevelt Rd.
Westchester, Illinois 60153

16. Charles A. Bennett Co., Inc.
809 W. Detweiller Dr.
Peoria, Illinois 61614

17. Benziger Bruce & Glencoe, Inc.
8701 Wilshire Blvd.
Beverly Hills, Calif. 90211

18. The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.
4300 W. 62nd St.
Indianapolis, Ind. 46206

19. Boxmar Publishing Co.
Box 3623
Glendale, Calif. 91201

20. Cambridge Book Company
488 Madison Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10022

21. CEBCO/Standard Publishing
104 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10011

22. Chilton Book Company
Chilton Way
Radnor, Pa. 19089

23. College & University Press
263 Chapel St.
New Haven, Conn. 06513

24. Communications Research Machines Books
1011 Camino Del Mar
Del Mar, California 92014

25. Cornell University Press
124 Roberts Pl.
Ithaca, N.Y. 14850

26. Coronet Learning Programs
65 E. South Water St.
Chicago, Illinois 60601

27. Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Inc.
666 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10019

28. Cuisenaire Co. of America
12 Church St.
New Rochelle, N.Y. 10805

29. Curriculum Development Associates
Suite 414
1211 Conn. Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

30. Dell Publishing Co., Inc.
One Dag Hammarskjold Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10017

31. Denoyer-Geppert
5325 Ravenswood Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60640

32. Dexter & Westbrook, Ltd.
958 Church St.
Baldwin, N.Y. 11510

33. Doubleday & Company, Inc.
245 Park Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10017

34. Howard A. Doyle
Box 310
Cambridge, Mass. 02139

35. The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.
Guilford, Conn. 06437

36. Editorial Services Co.
31 Union Sq. W.
New York, N.Y. 10003

37. Educational Media, Inc.
2213 First Capitol Dr.
St. Charles, Mo. 63301

38. Educational Methods, Inc.
500 N. Dearborn St.
Chicago, Ill. 60610

39. Educator's Publishing Service, Inc.
75 Moulton St.
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

40. Educational Products, Inc.
5005 W. 110th St.
Oak Lawn, Ill. 60453

41. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.
425 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, Ill. 60611

42. Everett/Edwards, Inc.
Box 1060
Deland, Fla. 32720

43. Fearon Publishers
6 Davis Dr.
Belmont, Calif. 94002

44. The Fideler Company
31 Ottowa Ave.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49502

45. Field Educational Publications, Inc.
2400 Hanover St.
Palo Alto, Calif. 94304

46. Field Enterprises Educational Corporation
510 Merchandise Mart Plaza
Chicago, Ill. 60654

47. Follett Corporation
1010 W. Washington Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60607

48. The Free Press
866 Third Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10022

49. Ginn & Company
191 Spring St.
Lexington, Mass. 02173

50. Globe Book Company, Inc.
175 Fifth Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10010

51. Gordon & Breach, Science Publishers, Inc.
1 Park Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10016

52. Gould Publications
199 State St.
Binghamton, New York 13901

53. Grolier Educational Corporation
845 Third Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10022

54. Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich
757 Third Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10017

55. Harper & Row, Publishers
2500 Crawford
Evanston, Ill. 60201

56. Hayden Book Company, Inc.
50 Essex St.
Rochelle Park, N.J. 07662

57. D.C. Heath & Company
125 Spring St.
Lexington, Mass. 02173

58. Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc.
101 Fifth Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10003

59. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
383 Madison Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10017

60. Houghton Mifflin Company
1 Beacon St.
Boston, Mass. 02107

61. ITT Publishing
60 E. 42nd St.
New York, N.Y. 10017

62. International Book Corporation
7300 Biscayne Blvd.
Miami, Fla. 33138

63. Intext Educational Development Group
257 Park Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10010

64. Intext Educational Publishers
Dunmore, Pa. 18512

65. Jenkins Publishing Company
Box 2085
Austin, Texas 78767

66. Marshall Jones Company
Francestown, N.H. 03043

67. Laidlaw Brothers
Thatcher & Madison
River Forest, Illinois 60305

68. Learning Innovations Corp.
100-135 Metropolitan Ave.
Forest Hills, N.Y.

69. Learning Research Associates
1501 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10036

70. Learning Resource Center
1065 S.W. Greenburg Rd.
Portland, Oregon 97223

71. Learning Trends
115 Fifth Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10003

72. Lerner Publications Co.
241 First Ave. N.
Minneapolis, Minn. 55401

73. Leswing Press Inc.
750 Adrian Way
San Rafael, Calif. 94903

74. Lion Books
111 E. 39th St.
New York, N.Y. 10016

75. J.B. Lippincott Company
225 E. Washington Square
Philadelphia, Pa. 19105

76. Little, Brown and Company
34 Beacon St.
Boston, Mass. 02106

77. Litton Educational Publishing Inc.
450 W. 33rd St.
New York, N.Y. 10001

78. Lyons & Carnahan
407 E. 25th St.
Chicago, Illinois

79. Macmillan, Inc.
866 Third Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10022

80. McCormick - Mathers Publishing Company
450 W. 33rd St.
New York, N.Y. 10001

81. McDougal, Littell & Company
Box 1667
Evanston, Ill. 60204

82. McGraw-Hill Book & Educational Services Group
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, N.Y. 10020

83. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company
1300 Alum Creek Dr.
Columbus, Ohio 43216

84. Julian Messner
1 West 39th St.
New York, N.Y. 10018

85. Modern Curriculum Press, Inc.
13900 Prospect Rd.
Cleveland, Ohio 44136

86. National Textbook Company
8259 Niles Center Rd.
Skokie, Ill. 60076

87. Noble & Noble Publishers
1 Dag Hammarskjold Plaza
New York, N.Y. 10017

88. Open Court Publishing Company
1039 Eighth St.
LaSalle, Ill. 61301

89. Oxford Book Co., Inc.
11 Park Pl.
New York, N.Y. 10007

90. Pergamon Press, Inc.
Maxwell House
Fairview Park
Elmsford, N.Y. 10523

91. Pflaum/Standard
2285 Arbor Blvd.
Dayton, Ohio 45439

92. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 07632

93. G.P. Putnam's Sons
200 Madison Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10016

94. Rand McNally & Company
8255 Central Park Ave.
Skokie, Ill.

95. Random House
201 E. 50th St.
New York, N.Y. 10022

96. William H. Sadlier, Inc.
11 Park Place
New York, N.Y. 10007

97. Scholastic Book Services
50 W. 44th St.
New York, N.Y. 10036

98. Science Research Associates, Inc.
259 E. Erie St.
Chicago, Ill. 60611

99. Scott, Foresman and Company
1900 E. Lake Ave.
Glenview, Ill. 60025

100. Charles Scribner's Sons
597 Fifth Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10017

101. Silver Burdett Company
250 James St.
Morristown, N.J. 07960

102. Simon & Schuster, Inc.
630 Fifth Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10020

103. Steck-Vaughn Company
Box 2028
Austin, Texas 78767

104. Teacher's College Press
Columbia University
1234 Amsterdam Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10027

105. Transatlantic Arts Inc.
North Village Green
Levittown, N.Y. 11756

106. Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc.
Belmont, California 94002

107. Walker Educational Book Corp.
720 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10019

108. Western Publishing Company
1220 Mound Avenue
Racine, Wisconsin 53404

109. Westinghouse Learning Press
770 Lucerne Drive
Sunnyvale, California 94086

110. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
605 Third Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016

APPENDIX I

Contract for Publication

Articles of Agreement

AGREEMENT made this [illegible] day of [illegible], 1977, between Prentice-Hall, Inc., hereinafter called the "Publisher," and the American Political Science Association, a non-profit organization governed by the laws of the District of Columbia and hereinafter called "APSA," the Trustees of Indiana University, hereinafter called the "University," the Social Studies Development Center, a curriculum research and development organization operated by Indiana University and hereinafter called the "Center," and Judith A. Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus, hereinafter referred to collectively as the "Authors."

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, Authors have developed a curriculum program known as Comparing Political Experiences, and

WHEREAS, Authors, Center, APSA, and University are desirous of putting Comparing Political Experiences into the hands of as many school districts and educators as may be reasonably possible under all circumstances relevant to the development, publication and distribution of said program; and

WHEREAS, Publisher is in the business of publishing and distributing text materials,

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises herein contained and other good and valuable consideration, it is agreed by and between the parties hereto as follows:

Section 1: THE WORK

The Authors, as the creators of an individual work, agree to prepare and supply the Publisher with the manuscript of the work, tentatively entitled American Government: Comparing Political Experiences including teacher's manual and aids more specifically described in Section 11 herein, (herein called the "Work").

Section 2: AUTHORS, CENTER, APSA, AND UNIVERSITY GRANT TO PUBLISHER

A) The Authors, Center, APSA, and University hereby grant and assign exclusively to the Publisher, for a period of five (5) years from the date of first publication, the right to publish, market, distribute, and sell the Work in the English Language in the United States and Canada. Work will be copyrighted in the name of the American Political Science Association. After five years from the date of first publication, APSA must license the aforesaid rights in the Work in the English language free of charge to domestic persons (i.e., resident natural person citizens) of the United States and Canada, including Publisher. Publisher agrees to place the following legend at least once on each component of the Work:

"© Copyright 1979 by American Political Science Association. Except for rights in material contained in the Work previously copyrighted by others as well as by Prentice-Hall, Inc., the American Political Science Association and Prentice-Hall, Inc., hereby grant permission without charge to domestic persons (i.e., resident natural person citizens) of the United States and Canada for use of materials contained in the Work and related materials in the English language in the United States and Canada after December 31, 1983. For conditions of use and permission to use this textbook or any of the related materials or any part thereof for foreign publications or publications in other than the English language,

apply to Prentice-Hall, Inc. Publication pursuant to the foregoing permission is conditioned upon the proper placement of the copyright notice "© Copyright 1979 by American Political Science Association" in each copy of each publication together with the following statement:

'This material was prepared with the financial support of National Science Foundation Grant No. SED 72-05814-A08. However, any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation or the American Political Science Association.'"

B) The Authors, Center, University, and APSA specifically authorize Publisher to copyright each item in the name of APSA. Publisher agrees to publish each copy of the Work with a copyright notice in accordance with the Universal Convention. Any expense of application for copyright registration will be borne by Publisher, and Publisher shall apply for same within six months after first publication.

C) Subject to approval by the National Science Foundation, the Publisher will act as the agent for the Authors, Center, APSA, and University in distributing and selling the Work in the English language overseas during the aforesaid five-year period of exclusivity.

Section 2A: RIGHTS OF PUBLISHER FOLLOWING EXPIRATION OF PERIOD OF EXCLUSIVITY

The Publisher will have the right on a nonexclusive basis to publish, market, distribute, and sell the Work in the English language in the United States and Canada following expiration of the aforesaid five-year period of exclusivity.

Section 3: PUBLISHER'S GRANT TO UNIVERSITY

A) Publisher shall make available to the University a grant of $1,600 to be used to meet necessary administrative costs directly associated with the Work. The grant period will begin on October 1, 1977. The grant will be paid in four installments of $400 each:

the first installment on October 1, 1977; the second installment on December 1, 1977; the third installment on February 1, 1978; and the fourth installment on April 1, 1978.

B) This grant is non-refundable except that in the event the agreement to publish the work is terminated under the provisions of this agreement prior to the actual publication by Publisher or is terminated for any reason after publication prior to the expiration of the five-year exclusive term, any part of the grant not paid as of the date of termination will be returned to Publisher.

C) This grant is made upon the understanding that Publisher or their, at any time prior to the expiration of the copyright term and during reasonable business hours, it may examine and audit the records of the Laboratory for Educational Development, Indiana University, with respect to the expenditure of money in accordance with this grant.

Section 4: PUBLICATION DEADLINE

Provided that the manuscript of the Work has been delivered pursuant to the terms and conditions of Section 5 of this agreement, the Publisher shall publish same no later than March 1, 1979 failing which, Authors, Center, NPSA, and University may arrange for publication elsewhere. The time of the Publisher to publish the work shall be extended for a time equal to any delays in the delivery of the manuscript as provided for in Section 5.

Section 5: DELIVERY OF MANUSCRIPT

A) The Authors will comply with the schedule, attached hereto (Attachment A) and made a part hereof, and deliver to the Publisher, acceptable in form and content to the Publisher, a complete manuscript of the Work in typewritten form, in its entirety as described in Section 11 hereof, together with a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

preface, or foreword, to the student textbook and also suggestions for maps, drawings, photographs, and other illustrations. If the Authors default in any part of their foregoing obligation, the Publisher may at its option terminate this agreement by notice in writing to the Authors, Center, APEA, and University, and the Publisher shall have the right to recover all monies, subject to the provisions in Section 3, which it may have advanced to the University under this agreement, and the University agrees to return such monies upon demand.

3) In the event a complete manuscript of the Work in its entirety as described in Section 11 is not delivered to the Publisher according to the schedule in Attachment A and the Publisher does not elect to terminate this agreement, the Publisher will have the further option to complete the Work, in which event the cost and expense thereof shall be deducted from royalties payable by the Publisher under this agreement.

Section 5: AUTHORS' WARRANTY

A) The Authors represent and warrant that they are the sole authors of the Work, subject to the National Science Foundation regulations covered herein as to copyright term; that the Work is original; that it has not previously been published; that it does not violate or infringe upon any personal or property rights of others, or infringe any copyright, whether common law or statutory, and contains nothing libelous or otherwise contrary to law.

B) Authors shall indemnify and hold harmless the Publisher and those to whom the Publisher may license or grant rights hereunder from any and all loss, damage, liability, or expense, including reasonable attorney's fees arising out of any breach or alleged breach of any of the foregoing warranties.

C) The foregoing warranties, representatives, and indemnifications shall survive the termination of this agreement.

D) If during the term of this agreement, Publisher believes that the copyright or any other rights in and to the work or any part thereof, have been infringed or otherwise violated, Publisher shall have the right to bring action, in the name of APSA, Authors, Center, and University and in such event, shall pay all charges and expenses and retain all recoveries in an amount sufficient to offset all such charges and expenses; thereafter any remaining sums recovered shall be divided equally between APSA and Publisher. If Publisher refuses to bring such action, after sixty (60) days written notice from APSA requesting it to do so, APSA may then bring such action, paying all charges and expenses, and retain all recoveries in an amount sufficient to offset all such charges and expenses; thereafter, any remaining sums recovered shall be divided equally between APSA and Publisher.

E) If one party brings an action as above, any other party shall reasonably cooperate in the prosecution thereof, provided such other party shall not be required to incur expense or be exposed to liability resulting from recoveries under any cross-complaints or counterclaims filed by party defendants to said action. Nothing contained herein, however, shall in any way relieve the Authors, Center, APSA, or University from their respective obligations under the warranties, representations, and indemnities provided for under paragraphs A), B), and C) of this Section 6.

F) The parties to this agreement hereby grant to the United States Government a world-wide, royalty free, nonexclusive and irrevocable license to reproduce, perform, translate, and otherwise use and to authorize others to use all or any part of the first edition only of the Work for United States Governmental purposes. This grant shall not apply to any part of the Work which may have been previously copyrighted by Publisher or others.

Section 7: PERMISSIONS

A) The Publisher shall obtain permission for the use of previously published copyrighted materials. Permissions fees and cost of securing permissions will be charged against royalties payable by the Publisher hereunder.

B) Publisher will procure such art and art permissions including, but not limited to, line drawings, photographs, maps, cartoons and graphs as required for use in the Work. The originals of such art shall be sole property of Publisher.

Section 8: ALTERATIONS

If the Authors make, or cause to be made, alterations in type, illustrations, or plates which are not corrections of typographical or draftsman's errors and which are in excess of ten percent (10%) of the cost of preparation independent of such alterations, the cost of such alterations in excess of ten percent (10%) shall be charged against royalties payable by the Publisher hereunder.

Section 9: MANUSCRIPT CHANGES

Publisher shall have the right to make such editorial changes in the Work or any revision thereof at any time as it deems desirable and necessary, but only after mutual agreement between Publisher and the Authors if the change is substantial, which agreement shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.

Section 10: STYLE AND MANNER OF PUBLICATION

A) The Publisher hereby agrees for it, its successors, representatives and assigns that they will, after delivery to them of the manuscript of the Work as aforesaid and its approval by their editors, proceed, promptly, to publish the said Work in suitable style as to format, packaging as indicated

below, and at a price such as, in its sole judgment, best meets the requirements of the market, using the customary means to market the said Work; and reprint said Work as the Publisher deems the demand for the same may require.

B) All of the parties hereto agree that the Work will be made available within the school districts using the Work for inspection by parents or guardians of children engaged in educational programs or projects of that school district; however, nothing herein shall require any of the parties hereto to distribute free copies of the Work to such school districts.

Section 11: DESCRIPTION OF WORK

A) The Work will consist of the following components:

1. Hard cover student text of approximately 640 pages
2. A teacher's guide
3. A skills and evaluation package

B) Publisher agrees to print the following disclaimer at least once on each component of the Work:

"This material was prepared with the financial support of National Science Foundation Grant No. SED 72-05814-A00. However, any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation or the American Political Science Association."

Section 12: ROYALTIES

A) As its total royalty obligation to all parties under this agreement, Publisher will pay to APSA the following percent of its net sales arising from sale of all copies of the Work. ("Net Sales" as used herein means

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the total amount of cash actually received by the Publisher, less bad debts, discounts allowed to third parties, discounts allowed to any subsidiary or division of the Publisher, freight and handling, sales and other taxes or duties, returns and refunds.)

Royalty Schedule

Item	Copies or Units Sold	Royalty as a Percentage of Sales
Student text	1-100,000	6%
	100,001-200,000	8%
	200,001-and over	10%
Skills and evaluation package	1 and over	3%
Teacher's guide and teacher's auxiliary materials or supplements	1 and over	0.0%

B) On any materials prepared by the Authors and sold, collateral to the student text, which are not identified in the foregoing royalty schedule, or the sale or use of any rights therein, the Publisher shall pay APSA one-half the minimum royalty for student text provided for in the foregoing schedule.

C) On copies of each component of the Work or sheets sold under state adoption contracts, or on proceeds received under state printing contracts, the Publisher shall pay APSA one-half the minimum royalty for each component as provided for in the foregoing schedule.

D) Publisher will render semi-annual reports of the sale of the Work to APSA during March and September of each year, covering the six-month period ending the prior December 31 and June 30 respectively, and at the time of rendering each statement will make settlement for any balance shown to be due.

Section 12: SUBSIDIARY RIGHTS

A) Subject to approval by the Authors, APSA, Center, University and the National Science Foundation which approval shall not be unreasonably

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

withheld nor delayed by any such party, the Publisher shall have the exclusive unlimited right until December 31, 1983, to license or permit others to publish, reproduce and provide the Work in whole or in part and in any and all forms and formats, including, by way of illustration and not by way of limitation:

translation, abridgment, adaptation, selection, film, television, broadcasting, sound reproducing and recording systems, microfilm, large type edition, braille or by way of other systems and materials for the presentation of the Work.

B) The net amount of any compensation received by the Publisher from such use by others shall be divided equally between the Publisher and APSA. The Publisher may authorize such use by others without compensation to APSA or the Publishers if, in the Publisher's judgment, such use may benefit the sale of the Work. If any of the foregoing rights shall be exercised by the Publisher itself, APSA shall be paid one-half the minimum royalty provided for in the royalty schedule in Section 12. On copies of the Work sold through any subsidiary of the Publisher or through any of the Publisher's book club divisions or institutes, or by radio, television, mail order or coupon advertising direct to the consumer, the Publisher shall pay APSA one-half the minimum royalty provided for in the royalty schedule in Section 12. No royalty shall be paid on copies given away or exchanged for other books for the purpose of introduction. Should the Publisher deem it necessary to sell any overstock of the Work at a reduced price, APSA shall be paid the full regular royalty on such sales except that, on sales made below the manufacturing costs of the book plus royalties, no royalties shall be paid. All copies of the Work sold and all compensation from sales of the Work under this Section shall be excluded

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in computing the royalties payable pursuant to Section 12 hereof; and amounts due APSA under this Section shall be computed and shown separately from royalties due APSA under Section 12 hereof in reports rendered to APSA.

C) Publisher is not permitted to publish the Work in a foreign edition or to grant others permission to publish in a foreign edition without first securing the approval of the Authors, Center, University, APSA and the National Science Foundation.

Section 14: AUTHORS' PROPERTY

The Publisher shall not be responsible for the loss of or damage to any property of the Authors, except for loss or damage due to its own negligence.

Section 15: REVISIONS OF WORK

A) During the first four years following the first publication of the Work, Publisher and Authors will cooperate in the publication of such revisions and adaptations as they may mutually agree are desirable, including such corrections and other changes as may be required for state or other adoptions.

B) All such revisions and adaptations which are published during the period of exclusive publication rights shall be subject to all the terms and conditions of this agreement.

C) The Authors will perform the usual duties in the preparation of all revisions of the Work or their portion of the said Work and its correlated adjunctive materials within the terms of this agreement. Where the Authors are unable or unwilling for whatever reason to make a suitable and timely revision, the Publisher may have such revision made under its direction or arrange for the preparation of revision and charge the literary and editorial cost thereof, including a fee paid to the reviser by the Publisher, against the royalty payable to APSA.

D) The Publisher may not publish any revision or adaptation of these materials at any time during the last year of the five-year exclusive period of this agreement. The copyright for any revision or adaptation of the materials

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

accomplished to any extent with National Science Foundation financial support, and published by the Publisher during the first four years of the five-year exclusive period of this agreement, may be claimed only to December 31, 1983.

Section 16: AUTHORS' COPIES

The Publisher agrees at the time of publication to provide free copies of the first printing of the Work as follows: six copies to each Author and to the University; 24 copies to APSA; 35 copies to the Center for distribution to pilot teachers. Additional copies may be purchased by the Authors, APSA, Center, and University at a sum equal to twenty-five percent (25%) of the then current list price of the Work for personal use and not for resale.

Section 17: ADVERTISING AND PROMOTION

Publisher shall be entitled to advertise, promote and sell the Work in such manner as it deems appropriate. Publisher will make only technical claims as are consistent with the quality and content of the Work, and shall not use the name of the National Science Foundation, the United States Government, or the American Political Science Association in connection with any such advertising and promotion in such a way as to imply an endorsement.

Section 18: RIGHT TO WITHHOLD PAYMENTS

In the event of any claims, suits, demands, actions, proceedings, recoveries, or expenses alleging that Authors have breached the provisions of Section 6 thereof, Publisher may withhold payments due APSA under this agreement until such claims are finally adjudicated or settled.

Section 19: TRANSFER OF RIGHTS

This agreement may not be assigned by any party without the written consent of the other parties and the National Science Foundation, except by operation of the law. Notwithstanding any such assignments, this agreement shall be binding upon the parties hereto, and their heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns.

Section 20: AUDIT AND RECORDS

During the period of the agreement and for three years thereafter, APSA, the National Science Foundation, and their duly authorized representatives shall have the right to examine, audit, and copy Prentice-Hall, Inc. records pertinent to its obligations under this agreement, including books and records of sales and royalties of the Work, at any time during the business day upon reasonable prior written notice. No more than two such inspections shall be made during any calendar year. Such records must be kept available for inspection and audit during that period.

Section 21: TERMINATION

A) The Publisher may, whenever the film and/or plates shall be destroyed or injured by fire or otherwise, discontinue the manufacture and sale of the said Work or, at its option, may reproduce said film and/or plates and continue the manufacture and sale of said Work upon the terms and conditions hereof.

B) If Publisher desires to terminate publication of the Work, it may do so by giving written notice of such intent to Authors, APSA, Center, and University by registered mail, whereupon this agreement shall terminate and Authors, Center, APSA, and University will then be free to proceed to immediately negotiate for a new publication agreement, subject to the approval of the National Science Foundation, without any further obligation to Publisher. Accumulated royalties, plus any further royalties due and payable by Publisher resulting from disposal of its stock of the Work shall be paid to APSA within sixty (60) days from the date of said notice of termination or within sixty days of such disposal, whichever is later. Publisher shall thereafter be prohibited from manufacturing or causing to be manufactured any further components of the Work until five years after first publication, provided however that the Publisher shall have the right, on the royalty basis stipulated in Section 12, to continue to sell and manufacture any of the works on hand or in the process of manufacture to meet the Publisher's contractual commitments.

C) If at any time Authors, APSA, Center, and University and Publisher jointly agree in writing that the Work should be withdrawn from publication because it has been superseded by a refined version or because it is no longer a viable educational product, or for any other reason, this agreement shall be deemed to be terminated by mutual consent.

D) Any party to this agreement may terminate the agreement if any one party commits a substantial breach of the agreement and shall fail to remedy the breach within ninety (90) days after dispatch of a written notice by certified mail, return receipt requested, requesting the remedy of such breach,

E) This agreement shall be terminated if a court having competent jurisdiction shall have made or entered any decree or order (i) adjudging Publisher to be a bankrupt or insolvent, (ii) approving as properly filed a petition seeking reorganization of Publisher or an arrangement under the bankruptcy law or any other applicable debtor's relief law or statute of the United States or any state, (iii) appointing a receiver, trustee, or assignee of Publisher in bankruptcy or insolvency or for its property or (iv) directing the winding up or liquidation of Publisher, and such decree or order shall have continued unstayed or undischarged for a period of thirty (30) days, or Publisher shall have voluntarily submitted to or filed a petition seeking any such decree or order.

F) This agreement shall be terminated if Publisher shall have assigned its assets for the benefit of its creditors, or the sequestration or attachment of or execution on any substantial part of the property of Publisher shall have occurred, and Publisher shall have failed to obtain a return or a release of such property within thirty (30) days thereafter or prior to sooner sale pursuant to such sequestration, attachment, or levy.

G) This agreement shall be terminated if Publisher shall have voluntarily suspended its business.

Section 22: LIMITATION ON CHARGES AGAINST ROYALTIES

No expenses will be charged by the Publisher against royalties unless specifically authorized in this agreement or in subsequent written authorizations.

Section 23: SINGULAR AND PLURAL

Wherever required by the context, the singular shall include the plural and the plural the singular.

Section 24: APPLICABLE LAW

This agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of New York. Any terms, conditions or provisions which are required by applicable Federal law to be inserted in this agreement shall be deemed to be fully incorporated in this agreement and are an integral part hereof.

Section 25: SEVERABILITY OF AGREEMENT

If the provision in this agreement contravenes or is otherwise invalid under the law of the United States or the State of New York, then such provision shall be deemed eliminated from this agreement, and the agreement shall, as so modified, remain valid and binding upon the parties hereto, and in full force and effect.

Section 26: FORCE MAJEURE

None of the parties shall be deemed in breach of this agreement nor shall the Work be deemed out of production because of a failure to perform or delays caused by wars, civil riots, strikes, fires, acts of God, governmental restrictions or other similar or dissimilar circumstances beyond the control of the party whose performance was so prevented or delayed.

Section 27: HEADINGS

The headings contained in this agreement have been inserted for convenience only and in no way define or limit the scope or interpretation of this agreement.

Section 28: MERGER

This instrument and the letter of August 22, 1977, from Robert B. Stewart to Howard Mehlinger contain the entire understanding between the parties, there being merged herein all prior and collateral representations, promises, and conditions in connection with the subject matter hereof. Any representations, warranties, promises or conditions not expressly incorporated herein, shall not be binding on either party.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the said parties hereto have executed this instrument the day and year above written.

WITNESS

AUTHORS

Judith Gillespie

Stuart Lazarus

SOCIAL STUDIES DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Howard Mehlinger, Director

TRUSTEES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

J. D. Mulholland, Treasurer

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Thomas Mann

Evron Kirkpatrick

Evron Kirkpatrick, Executive Director

PRENTICE-HALL, INC.

James J. Peoples, President
Educational Book Division

Aug 25, 1977

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Attachment A: Schedule

Manuscript copy for the student textbook, unit tests and chapter check-ups, reinforcement activities, and overview material for the teacher's guide will be completed by the Authors and submitted to the Publisher by January 1, 1978.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE